DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 444 UD 017 836

TITLE Beyond Emerging Needs; Proceedings of a Workshop-Oriented Conference on Consolidating a Decade's Gains in Expanding Higher Education Opportunity.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE [10 Nov 76]
NOTE 180p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; *Educational Opportunities; *Higher Education; *Program Administration; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Improvement; Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS *Higher Education Opportunity Program

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of a conference on the status of Higher Education Opportunity Programs are presented in this volume. The main concern throughout the conference was the loss of identity of the special programs that would come with their mainstreaming or institutionalization within the college. Counselors complained about the enormous paperwork and tie-ups that are generated by the application format for these programs. Late return of student applications was also discussed. One of the issues considered was financial aid for the independent or emancipated opportunity student. The conference aimed at looking for ways of improving the following: program effectiveness, the utilization of college resources for program administration, bilingual and bicultural programming, the detection and effective use of fiscal resources, student achievement, curriculum management, math and science learning skills, reading and writing skills, diagnostic testing, achievement motivation, the orientation of students to campus resources, the provision of personal and academic advisement, educational opportunity in the world of work, access to graduate and professional schools, career counseling, evaluative research, and the tapping of community resources. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151444

Beyond Emerging Needs

Proceedings of A Workshop-Oriented Conference on
Consolidating a Decade's Gains in Expanding Higher Education Opportunity

JAN 17 1978

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
The New York Statewide Committee on Educational Opportunity
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

UD017836

Sponsored by the Statewide Committee on Educational Opportunity
Appointed by the Commissioner of Education, State of New York

November 8-10, 1976
Rochester, New York

Members of the

New York State Commissioner of Education's

Statewide Advisory Committee on Educational Opportunity

1976

Mr. Carl Bello, Health Manpower Program Specialist, United States Office of Education
Mrs. Mattie Cook, Administrative Director, Malcolm-King: Harlem Extension College
Dr. Harold Delaney, Chairperson, National Institute of Education
Candido DeLeon, President, Hostos Community College
Dr. Vera King Farris, Associate Vice-President for Instruction & Curriculum, SUNY Brockport
Dr. Edmund W. Gordon, Professor & Chairman, Department of Applied Human Development & Guidance, Teachers College of Columbia University
Arnold Goren, Vice Chancellor, New York University
Lester W. Ingalls, Vice President & Secretary, Association of Colleges & Universities of the State of New York
Sister Dorothy Ann Kelly, President, College of New Rochelle
Dr. Moses Koch, President, Monroe Community College
Dr. Thomas Leach, Director, Brooklyn Educational Opportunity Center
Dr. Leonard Lief, President, Herbert H. Lehman College
Dr. Paul A. Miller, President, Rochester Institute of Technology
Dr. Isaiah Reid, Director, Educational Opportunity Program, SUNY Buffalo
Dr. James S. Smoot, Vice Chancellor for University-wide Services and Special Programs, State University of New York
Ms. Yvonne M. Tormes, Director, College Discovery Program, City University of New York
Dr. Rachel Weddington, University Dean for Teacher Education, City University of New York
Mr. Herman W. Wright, Office of Special Programs, City University of New York
Dr. Stephen J. Wright, Vice President, College Entrance Examination Board
Dean Robert Young, University Dean for Special Programs, City University of New York

STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Dr. Alvin P. Lierheimer, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education
Stephen H. Adolphus, Chief, Bureau of Higher Education Opportunity Programs
Douglas P. Mercado, Associate in Higher Education Opportunity, Secretary

JAN 17 1978

BEYOND EMERGING NEEDS

Proceedings of
A Workshop-Oriented Conference
on Consolidating a Decade's Gains
in Expanding Higher Education
Opportunity

Sponsored by the Statewide Committee on Educational Opportunity
Appointed by the Commissioner of Education, State of New York

November 8-10, 1976
Rochester, New York

The development of these proceedings was supported by The ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education of The Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, pursuant to a contract with The National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment in professional matters. Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of The National Institute of Education.

INTRODUCTION

Last November 8th, 9th and 10th at the Americana Hotel in Rochester, New York, the Statewide Committee on Educational Opportunity sponsored a three-day conference on the status of Higher Education Opportunity Programs -- Beyond Emerging Needs. The workshop-oriented conference -- the second on HEOP -- was well attended by a representative cross section of the educational community. The over 300 participants included college presidents, opportunity counselors, program directors, financial aid officers, and representatives of the Higher Education Services Corporation (HESC) and HEW.

Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP) counselors and coordinators took the opportunity to voice some of their major concerns about the management and survival of HEOP. The most pervasive thought throughout the three-day meeting was the loss of identity of the special programs that would come with their mainstreaming (or institutionalization within the colleges' traditional fiscal administration. "Its separation is what makes it work" is the way most counselors capsulized HEOP's present effectiveness as a separate entity.

The application-for-eligibility form which all students who apply for the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) and the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) must complete was rapped as unneccessarily lengthy. Counselors complained of the enormous paperwork and tie-ups that are generated by the so-called "green monster" application and suggested that the requirements and procedures for completion serve only as a stumbling

block and discouragement to students who are seriously interested in a college education. Late return of student applications from the Albany office was the subject of lengthy discussions with Albany personnel and especially with Eileen Dickinson, President of the Higher Education Services Corporation (HESC) which is at the receiving end of the completed -- or incomplete -- applications. She told of the Corporation's dilemma in necessarily delaying applications which are missing institution identification numbers or other details that slow up or altogether halt the application process.

Keynote and guest speakers at the conference provided provoking remarks that stimulated the senses of an already keen audience. Through general session panel formats, and professional and special interest workshops and group meetings, many pressing issues were discussed and in some instances brought to a solution.

One of the issues scheduled for discussion was financial aid for the independent or emancipated opportunity student. Participants agreed that because of the involved application form, financial aid for this group of students was difficult to obtain if not altogether elusive. All conference participants were looking for ways of improving the following: program effectiveness within HEOP; the utilization of college resources for program administration; bilingual and bicultural programming; the detection and effective use of fiscal resources; student achievement; curriculum management; math/science learning skills and reading and writing skills; diagnostic testing, achievement motivation; the orientation of

students to campus resources; the provision of personal and academic advisement; educational opportunity in the world of work; access to graduate and professional school; career counseling; evaluative research; and the tapping of community resources.

The first day of the conference, Monday, November 8th began with an 11:00 a.m. registration at the Americana Hotel and a Call to Order by James S. Smoot, Vice Chancellor for Educational Services at SUNY and host of the conference. General Session I, in the afternoon, was followed by gatherings of professional and special interest groups. The second and third days of the conference began with General Sessions II and III respectively, each of which was followed by Concurrent Workshops. Generally speaking, the proceedings of the conference as presented here follow the order in which they took place. The only exceptions are first, that in some cases speeches and recorder's notes were not provided so those parts of the proceedings were necessarily omitted, and second, that the speeches of the keynote and guest speakers are presented in a separate section after the reports of the General Sessions and the Concurrent Workshops.

Special thanks to the Monroe Community College Jazz Ensemble for their first evening choral performance and to Garth Fagan's Bottom of the Bucket Dance Company.

GENERAL SESSION I -- SUMMARY

Topic: "Presidential Perspectives on Institutionalizing Opportunity Programs"

Moderator: Sister Dorothy Ann Kelly
President
College of New Rochelle
New Rochelle, New York

Panelists: Dallas K. Beal
President
State University College
Fredonia, New York

David C. Knapp
Provost
Cornell University
Corning, New York

Herbert M. Sussman
President
New York City Community College
Brooklyn, New York

Opportunity program administrators and couselors were troubled by what they saw as the long-range implications of institutionalizing HEOP programs and were against such a prospect. Because of time factors and the volume of students to be serviced, they argued, the traditional college counselor cannot effectively handle the problems of the opportunity student. It takes a counselor who is especially aware of the kinds of problems that often accompany the nontraditional student participating for the first time in unfamiliar rituals to sensitively and effectively provide the kind of services required.

If the programs were mainstreamed there would be an overflow of personnel and, the counselors said, the "last hired would be the first fired." The counselors felt that this would mean not only an end to their jobs, but also a general undermining of the special services and a complete loss of identification of the opportunity programs.

Cornell Provost, David Knapp, spoke of his college's success with the mainstreaming method. But, unconvinced, members of the audience offered examples of why it would be a destructive move across campuses, particularly with the extremely large inner-city minority student population.

GENERAL SESSION II -- SUMMARY

Topic: "Financial Aid for the Emancipated Opportunity Student"

Moderator: Thomas Leach
Director
Educational Opportunity Center
Brooklyn, New York

Panelists: Richard P. Biondi
Director of Financial Aid
Iona College
Iona, New York

Russel Gould
Counselor, Higher Education Opportunity Program
New York University
New York, New York

Martin L. Lefkovits
Director of Financial Aid Services
State University of New York
Albany, New York

Address by: Eileen Dickinson
President
Higher Education Services Corporation
Albany, New York

General Session II provided the liveliest of exchanges among conference participants. Panel moderator, Thomas Leach, Director of the Educational Opportunity Center in Brooklyn, New York, outlined some of the major administrative problems facing campus administrators and more directly, opportunity students. Program directors, financial aid officers, and counselors complained of the domino affect on administrative procedures that was caused by the late receipt of the blank applications

from Albany. They vigorously questioned the procedure for students proving their emancipation (independent status) and faulted the Albany administration for the poor communication lines.

Eileen Dickinson delivered an address on the financial aid problem. The panelists responded by expressing their own opinions; they shared some of their more workable methods for successfully completing applications, and fielded questions from the audience.

The panelists agreed that the most significant barrier for the opportunity student is the application form. Dubbed the "green monster," the form drew considerable attention throughout the panel presentation and the workshops that followed. Mrs. Dickinson highlighted the difficulties faced by HESC's end of the application. She advised that the Corporation must handle all emancipation requests as well as determine the student's general qualifications for financial aid. HESC, she said, faces a multitude of problems:

1. It was recently decided that the application form used in previous years, too liberally permitted students to emancipate themselves by merely stating that they were financially independent. This eventually led to a State Supplemental Budget in 1976, in which the President of HESC was required to establish rules and regulations for determining the independent status of undergraduate students 22 years of age and under. The Corporation's resulting case-by-case reviews of individual requests for emancipation contributed to a further slowing down of the application process.

2. In the past year, there was an initially large cost overrun in which TAP funds were underestimated. In addition, City University students unexpectedly became TAP candidates. The appropriation for 1976-77 had then to be increased from $117 million to over $170 million. Because of the large numbers of candidates, HESC operations have been monitored and awards closely watched for duplication, slowing down the completion process even further.
3. Forms often arrive at HESC with inaccurate batch and sequence numbers and missing college codes. They cannot be processed without these numbers, and are put aside for a later review.
4. An unexpected late start-up date for 1976 -- August 8th rather than July 1st -- resulted in delays in sending out application forms. Only 23 percent of the applications were accurately completed by the September semester.

Mrs. Dickinson went on to provide a few statistics to dramatize the problem of backlogged applications at the HESC office. Of the 420,000 applications that have been received, she said, there have been only 180,000 awards. Eighty-five thousand applications are for independent status. Eighty-four of those eighty-five thousand applicants still owe HESC letters in response to queries regarding their applications. These and other observations by Mrs. Dickinson drew strong responses from panel members.

Martin Lefkovits pointed out that the Corporation has administratively applied strict application requirements to the 22-year and older students, which is usually the emancipated group and the backlog of applications that exists is for those over 22. Many of them have families to care for and other adult responsibilities and are financially hurting. "Everyone knew costs would go up for TAP," he said, "but the talk about emancipation being a big problem is something people are grabbing onto as an excuse."

Russel Gould found that a big problem he and his colleagues experience with late applications is follow-up. There doesn't seem to be any particular contact person in the State office who knows what stage of administration the completed applications are in or where they are physically situated. He suggested that counselors establish a telephone relationship with one person at the HESC office so that application movement can be successfully facilitated and some kind of accountability developed.

Richard Biondi felt that the lack of communication between HESC and the campuses and even among the financial aid officers and counselors themselves, has helped make for garbled messages to the Governor's office and the legislature. An overemphasis on duplication of awards has resulted in cutbacks. The fear of overawarding has led to requirements that have caused many of the existing problems. There is also a fear that campus activities will be misconstrued by auditors and administrative actions misunderstood. Given all of these possibilities, he foresees a future shortfall of funds for the opportunity programs.

In summary, Mrs. Dickinson offered suggestions for relieving some of the dilemma the schools and students face with the financial aid forms. She advised counselors to exhaust all means of tracing missing applications and getting back the green forms. When determining emancipation, she said, "the key is dereliction or abrogation of parental responsibility. Extreme poverty and independence are not necessarily the same thing."

WORKSHOPS -- SUMMARIES AND PAPERS

Workshop on: "Critical Issues in Bilingual/Bicultural Education"
(Title changed from "Bilingual/Bicultural Programming")

Moderator: Yvonne M. Tormes
University Administrator
College Discovery Program
City University of New York
New York, New York

Panelists: Evelio Penton
Department of Foreign Languages
Kingsborough Community College
City University of New York
Brooklyn, New York

Clara Velazquez
Director of the ESL Program
Hostos Community College
City University of New York
Bronx, New York

Genaro Marin
Director of Project BEST
Herbert H. Lehman College
City University of New York
Bronx, New York

Recorder: Laraine Bengis
Program Planner and Developer
College Discovery Program
City University of New York
New York, New York

Ms. Tormes opened this workshop by greeting those present and introducing the panel members.

She proceeded to mention several critical issues of importance to bilingual/bicultural education which would be discussed by the panelists.

One issue not included in the panel topics because of its relative recency, but of great concern to Ms. Tormes, is a national trend on the part of the U.S. Office of Education to dismantle bilingual/bicultural programs under the TRIO Programs. She cited the October 21, 1976, issue of Higher Education Daily which states that "Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) has asked the Office of Education for a full accounting of its funding of TRIO program projects in the last two years following charges the agency has made a covert policy move to cut back, eliminate and/or transfer substantial numbers of TRIO programs serving disadvantaged youth in Spanish-speaking communities of the Southwest and California."

In New York City, Ms. Tormes pointed out, we were a victim of this trend, since Project Adelante, the only Upward Bound bilingual/bicultural educational program for high school youth in New York City and, for that matter, in all of Region II, excluding Puerto Rico, was abruptly dismantled. Adelente was terminated, despite the fact that for the last three consecutive years, the U.S. Office of Education gave it high ratings and 100% of its graduates are currently enrolled in college.

She urged support for the continuance of these vital programs and asked anyone interested in their preservation to write to Senator Edward Kennedy or the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) in Washington, D.C.

Another issue of concern, Ms. Tormes suggested, in a bilingual/bicultural approach to education is the question of the "bi." Can we really develop bilingual/bicultural students who can successfully negotiate two languages and two cultures? There are educators who

believe it is feasible and others who say it is impossible and that we should only teach ESL courses in order to create English-speaking students as quickly as possible.

Second, there is the question of which "bi" to stress, the "lingual" or the "cultural." Perhaps the emphasis should be put on the cultural component (i.e., bicutlural/bilingual program) of such programs, since the cultural differences of students born and raised in another country may inhibit the learning process.

With the passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1967, funds were provided for teaching students in foreign languages, in addition to the English language, but mainly at the elementary and secondary school levels. The need for bilingual education programs at the college level has not yet been adequately defined, yet the question that naturally arises is: Should bilingual education be taught at the college level?

Ms. Tormes stressed the need for well-trained, sensitive teachers to teach bilingual programs, singling out Lehman College in New York City as being in the forefront of training bilingual paraprofessionals and bilingual teachers.

This workshop group engaged in a number of direct questions and responses. The keenest exchanges were the following:

Question: Can students who speak different languages be put in the same ESL class and be successfully taught?

Response: Dr. Velazquez replied that ESL and bilingual education support each other. In reality, any language can be taught in a class of multi-language students. It depends on the methodology of the teacher. If the teacher is well-trained and can empathize with the insecurity of her students, she will succeed. Of course, it would be better if the teacher knew all the languages of her students, but that is not likely to be the case.

Dr. Marin suggested that ESL is a component of bilingual education. ESL is a beginning. It is one piece of a whole picture with the "whole" being the student's need to know his heritage, his native language, etc.

Question: What would be viable counseling devices to use with bilingual students when a comprehensive bilingual/bicultural program is not available on a campus?

Response: Dr. Marin said that the student needs a center where he/she can find information and guidelines that will help him/her function in the College. There should be at least one person at this center who speaks the student's native language.

A member of the audience suggested that any counselor must have some understanding of the student's background and what the student is really saying, even though he/she is not explicitly asking for it.

Someone else recommended the use of trained "peer" counselors to help bilingual students adjust to college life and cope with the many everyday problems. Often students who speak the same language and come from similar backgrounds could be very useful in this capacity.

Question: What really is bicultural education as you perceive it?

Response: Dr. Velazquez responded by pointing out that the student learns how to function in two cultures and to switch back and forth from culture to culture. For example, from her own experience, touching a person of the opposite sex as a sign of friendliness in the U.S. is fine, but not so in Puerto Rico.

Question: How do we persuade our own college to institute bilingual programs?

Response: Dr. Marin said that at Lehman he got statistics to show the need for bilingual/bicultural programs. The College should produce courses when 15 or more students need it. You should also involve the community in your endeavor to establish bilingual programs.

THE TRAINING OF BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL TEACHERS

Genaro Marin
Coordinator, Bilingual/Bicultural Education
Herbert H. Lehman College

Synopsis

Educators, supervisors and leaders of all sorts must now take notice of the increased population of non-English-speaking children, especially in large cities. In New York, for instance, there has been a remarkable population shift in the last six years. Table I below shows the ethnic profile for adults during the 1970-1975 period.

TABLE I

ETHNIC PROFILE OF NEW YORK CITY 1970-1975

	1970	1975	DIFFERENCE
Puerto Ricans	811,843	912,824	+100,981
Blacks	1,615,348	1,644,494	+ 29,146
Whites	5,304,383	4,641,056	-663,327
Others	177,906	279,340	+101,434

The growth of the non-English-speaking child population has run parallel to that of adults. Most of the non-English-speaking children are of Hispano heritage (330,000 out of a total 1.1 million children).

We know from experience that traditional education has not worked, especially with minority children. However, the design and implementation

of bilingual programs has been met with resistance for it has been viewed as:

a. a threat to the status quo
b. a launching into a field for which there is no adequate research data
c. a lack of patriotism
d. a way of forcing Board of Education to hire minorities
e. the branching off of traditional education
f. various other reasons

More important than those fears and their overt and/or covert effects is the fact that bilingual/bicultural education has all the concomitant problems of an emerging field. Suddenly, an avalanche of experts has appeared, although there have been dedicated people seeking ways to educate non-English-speaking children for years. The reasons for this sudden interest in bilingual/bicultural education are varied, from enthusiastic to antagonistic. This fact is reflected in the numerous "bilingual programs" which exist, some as trial and error, some as coherent beginnings, some as window dressing. From the variety of versions and emphases, some trends are clear, however.

1. Linguistic trend: Many people believe and state that the most important thing for the non-English-speaking children is to learn English. Academic profiles show, however, that even when non-English-speaking children learn English, they still fail in school.

   Others use the child's mother tongue as a transition: they use Spanish at the beginning and gradually reduce the classes to become strictly in English.

   Others insist that Spanish must be maintained and improved as the children learn English.

2. Socio-cultural trends: It is held that the children should not be stripped of their cultural heritage as they enter and function in the mainstream culture. Music, folklore, ethnic celebrations are stressed as means to achieve curriculum content.

3. Experiential trend: It is apparent that the linguistic and/or socio-cultural trend alone can only produce an incomplete approach, regardless of merit. Any sound theory of learning and teaching applicable to the non-English-speaking children should:

   a. recognize and stress the relationship between what the individuals already know (from lived experiences) and the new experiences to be learned;

   b. recognize that the mother tongue is the vehicle of continuity between parents (and their culture) and children. Those children develop a style of life, a way of learning and behaving which is related to the experiential world in which they belong;

   c. the learning of English--or any other second language--must be related to the command of mother tongue the individuals possess already;

   d. that more than "teaching them English," or maintaining "culture," "mother tongue," or "nationality," the direct challenge and goal of bilingual/bicultural education is to educate the non-English-speaking children effectively. This means, to help the children receive, understand, interpret and transfer the academic content expected of all learners;

   e. the bilingual/bicultural teacher must be a good teacher, first of all, and at the same time, he/she must possess the knowledge, skills, and the sensitivities to communicate with non-English-speaking children and their parents.

Bilingual/bicultural education is a very important challenge in education, more so for institutions which train teachers.

Herbert H. Lehman College has participated in the training of bilingual paraprofessionals and bilingual teachers since 1970 in the form of pre-service and in-service training programs. The undergraduate and the graduate bilingual/bicultural programs reflect the experiential trend summarized above.

A LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL EDUCATION

Evelio Penton
Department of Foreign Languages
Kingsborough Community College

The Legal Foundations

In an idealized form any administrative process follows a logical sequence in which there is a progression from the making of a decision to the interpretation of the decision in the form of specific programs, to the communication of that programmed decision, to the establishment of controls for the realization of the decision, and finally to a re-appraisal of the decision as programmed, communicated and controlled.

In this process, the departing point, previous to programming, is the "decision" that in our situation means specific direction for action.

When we think in terms of bilingual/bicultural programming, the first difficulty we find is that the concept of bilingual/bicultural education is interpreted in many different ways.

My humble contribution today is to discuss breifly the concept and to ask for care and caution in a fundamental element of bilingual/bicultural programming.

The legal foundations of bilingual/bicultural education proceed from the legislative and judicial branches of the government. As we all know, bilingual/bicultural education in elementary and secondary schools is governed at the federal level by the Bilingual Education Act (BEA), which forms Title VII of the Act known as the "Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967." The Act was adopted by Congress in 1967 and was approved January 2, 1968. This Act had a tremendous effect on state and

local educational policies. Prior to its enactment, the majority of our fifty states had legislation making English the sole medium of instruction. Today most of the states have legislation, either explicit or supportive, concerning bilingual/bicultural education.

Court decisions are the second fundamental provisions governing bilingual/bicultural education. In 1974, in the Lau vs. Nichols decision, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a San Francisco school district must either overcome language barriers for students not receiving compensatory help or be threatened with the loss of its federal financial assistance. Other favorable court rulings on the issue were handed down in a school desegregation suit in Denver, Colorado, and in cases similar to Lau in Portales, New Mexico, and New York City.

The case of New York City has an extraordinary importance. On August 29, 1974, in Aspira of New York, Inc. vs. Board of Education of the City of New York, et al., the Board signed a consent decree in federal court whereby it agreed to work with Puerto Rican groups to implement a bilingual education program. Two weeks ago, October 22, the Board of Education and the School Chancellor of New York City were ruled in contempt of court for having "failed steadily and repeatedly to exercise their power to expedite a bilingual education program for Spanish-speaking students."

Lay Interpretations

In all the legislation we don't find a definition of bilingual/bicultural education, and so we have to go to the interpreters, who in most cases are independent and well intentioned, but on some occasions have axes to grind.

After a series of evaluations of the legislation enacted in 1967 by the General Accounting Office and by the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission outlined an important list of principles showing the advantages and characteristics of bilingual/bicultural education. One of the principles is expressed in this way: "By integrating the language and cultural background of all students, bilingual/bicultural education reinforces and increases the communication between home and school."

Let's review some of the common definitions of bilingual/bicultural education.

In his book, The Language of Education, Israel Scheffler discusses three types of definitions, the stipulative, the descriptive, and the programmatic.

A stipulative definition is one which is invented, or better perhaps, one which is given by its author who asks that the defined term be consistently taken to carry this stipulated meaning throughout his discussion. One might, for instance, say, "Look, I know that there are various definitions and views of 'bilingual education' currently in vogue, but in order to keep things straight, I shall use the expression bilingual education throughout my discussion (speech, article, book, etc.) to refer only to 'any kind of school activity whatsoever in which teachers who speak two languages are engaged with pupils who also speak the same two languages'." This is a stipulation. It is saying, "This is precisely what I will mean by the words 'bilingual education' regardless of what others may mean." (I am using this definition just as an example, not as any personal definition.)

The essence of a descriptive definition, however, is not a stipulative assertion that such and such will be my use of the term, but rather, that such a definition purports to adequately describe what is being defined or the way in which the term is used. In effect, a dictionary attempts to provide descriptive definitions, and thus, not infrequently, we find several definitions given for a word because many words have multiple descriptive meanings. However, the dictionary does not offer us several meanings to choose from in any arbitrary way; it provides us with the different ways in which a word is used in differing contexts. Thus, there is not a descriptive definition of "bilingual education," but many definitions describing the appropriate uses of that expression in different circumstances or for different purposes. So the U.S.O.E. Manual for Project Applicant and Grantees defined bilingual education as "the use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction for the same pupil population in a well-organized program which encompasses part or all of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue."

In contrast to the descriptive definition, the programmatic definition tells us overtly or implicitly that this is the way things should be. To say what something should be is quite different from trying to say what it actually is, or merely saying, "I'll use this to mean it for now." Consider, for example, this definition given by A. Shanker: "Bilingual education should provide a comfortable and rapid transition for the foreign-language child." Based on this prescriptive or normative statement, Shanker expressed

his dissatisfaction with the way bilingual education is being instituted in New York City, predicting that if the Board of Education "attempts to establish a separate, segregated school system based on language and ethnicity, they are sure to fail."

It is possible to analyze the variety of definitions that appears in the rich literature on bilingual education and have difficultly in finding one perfect omnicomprehensive definition that satisfies all the different positions and points of view.

We have to turn then to more simple statements, less solemn in manner, more popular, to be repeated warmly or reassuringly, rather than pondered gravely.

We have to consider the advantages in the use of a slogan instead of trying to find an ideal definition.

It is simple enough to notice that educational literature contains a surprisingly large number of such expressions as "Education for Life Adjustment," "Return to the Fundamentals," and "Pursuit of Excellence." At the beginning of this century John Dewey's statements soon were translated into striking fragments serving as slogans for the new progressive tendencies. The slogans are chosen to appeal to the feelings of the listener or reader. Sometimes slogans are used to do only this. Let us call this the ceremonial use of slogans, from the context in which this use is most typically encountered--a dedication, a convocation, an inauguration, or the like.

Slogans sometimes occur in textbooks, lectures, seminars, and in meetings of educational policy-makers. Here slogans are used to give information and direction to educational activity, to create and establish rather definite language customs for the profession. These we call non-ceremonial uses of slogans, and that is the use of the expression bilingual/bicultural education transformed into an educational slogan.

What does this slogan mean? Its meaning is in the different assertions it summarizes. Educational slogans always contain a prescriptive element and in the expression bilingual/bicultural education we find the right prescription.

The Implications of "Bi"

A. The fight against monolingualism: After World War I, a number of state legislatures passed laws forbidding the teaching of any non-English language to children below high school age levels. Among the most rigid laws was the Norval Act adopted by the Nebraska legislature in 1921 which made it unlawful to teach languages other than English before a pupil had successfully passed the eighth grade, the only exemptions being religious instruction on Sundays or other holidays through the non-English language, and the teaching of any foreign language to one's own children in the home. This law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on June 4, 1923.

B. Language implications: There is a slogan, "Watch out for the 'bi.'" For me the prefix "bi" is the basic element in the slogan. The prefix, with its meaning of two, or double, gives to the

slogan color, direction and significance. "Two" or "double" do not indicate knowing and living just the "other language" or the "other culture," but the two languages and the two cultures.

In a bilingual education system we are not to take for granted that the student has a thorough command of his native language. The knowledge of his language, of course, must be improved. In other words, both languages must be given equal attention and consideration.

C. Cultural implications:

1. Dangers of ethnocentrism: In a bicultural program it is fundamental to combat ethnocentrism, showing that, although ethnocentrism is a natural psychological phenomenon, when reason is applied it becomes a fallacy.
2. Prudence in the use of folkloric materials: Another point to be cautious of is the excessive use of folklore material, neglecting the true fundamental elements of the culture, such as history, arts, literature, science, etc.
3. Balance in biculturalism: The bicultural program must offer the student a balanced education. He must know Shakespeare... and Cervantes; Washington...and Bolivar; Lincoln...and Sarmiento; Emerson...and Hostos; Langston Hughes...and Palis Matos; Benjamin Franklin...and Andris Bello.

A RATIONALE FOR BILINGUAL PROGRAMS AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL

Clara Velazquez
Director, ESL Program
Hostos Community College

My presentation focuses on the need for bilingual education for Spanish-speaking college students in New York City. We recognize, however, that the recent large influx of Spanish-speaking students is exclusive neither to the college and university level nor to New York City. The problem of bilingual education exists throughout the entire school system of almost every metropolis in the United States. Indeed, the compulsory education laws of the nation have for many years perpetuated the need without providing the means for a solution. These laws require that children, whether citizens or not, attend school from an early age, usually six years, to their mid-teens. Since 1918, all states have had some such requirements for attendance at school, established in the interest of "the welfare of society and the need for a common education in good citizenship."[1] Nevertheless, for decades nothing was done to facilitate the foreign-born child's "osmosis" into the educational systems of the nation. Only recently have American educators become aware of the difficult linguistic situation in which a non-English-speaking child finds himself/herself when he/she is placed in an American classroom. This has led to legislative acts such as the Bilingual Education Act, which was introduced in the United States Senate in January 1967. Its intention

---

[1]R. F[reeman] B[u]t[ts], "History of Education," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1973.

was to conserve our language resources and to promote the learning of a child irrespective of his vernacular language. "It seeks to make learning the objective of the classroom, using other languages in addition to English to accomplish this objective."[2]

This kind of legislation has made possible the evolution of diverse strategies to be implemented for the solution of linguistic problems in education. The focus up to now, however, has been on biiingual education at the grammar school, and later the secondary school level. The need for bilingual education programs at the college level has not yet been adequately defined or adequately met.

New York City represents, perhaps, the heaviest concentration of problems in bilingual education. New York has always been a port of entry for the children of the world and their parents. This has made the New York area a polycultural and polylinguistic community where almost every established language has been represented. Although many immigrants have dispersed throughout the country, a large majority have remained, at least for a time, within the confines of New York City and its environs. Relaxation of the immigration laws during the Kennedy Administration resulted in a tremendous increase of the Spanish-speaking population of the area.[3] Prior to this, passage of the Jones Act, effective March 2, 1918, was a

---

[2]Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States (Austin: Southeast Educational Development Laboratory, 1970), I, p.v.

[3]I am indebted to my colleague Jose L. Keyes, whose dissertation in progress, "Hostos: A Model of Bilingual Education in Action," provided the above information.

critical legislative move contributing to the influx of the Spanish-speaking foreign-born. Under its terms, Puerto Rico became "a territory of the United States and citizenship was conferred collectively on Puerto Ricans...."[4] This gave the islanders freedom of movement to the continental United States. Due to the limitations of transportation during the early part of the century, only a handful of Puerto Ricans took advantage of this opportunity. After the Second World War, the promise of employment and the large-scale introduction of transcontinental passenger air service increased Puerto Rican migration tremendously. These factors have brought to the city during the last two or three decades hundreds of thousands of adults and children who are largely ignorant of the English language.

Some of these immigrants hoped to improve their education by attending institutions of higher learning within the city. College entrance examinations, with their heavy demand on written English comprehension prevented them from achieving this goal. Aspirants to college education have turned to crash courses[5] in English. These courses were usually associated with a "Continuing Education" program of the university or with an outside organization connected with the university and were devoted solely to the teaching of English preparatory to college admission. Some of these courses are still taught, however, the situation changed for a while as a result of the "open admissions policy" adopted in September 1973 by the nineteen

---

[4]T[homas] G. M[athew]s[on], "Puerto Rico," Encycolpedia Britannica, 1969.

[5]The following universities are examples of institutions which offer one-year immersion courses as preparation for college entrance: Columbia University, New York University and The University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

colleges of the City University of New York.[6] The new policy, dedicated to equal opportunity, opened the university's doors to hundreds of immigrants, some graduates of secondary schools, others with the educational preparation of a three-month high school equivalency course taught in Spanish. As most of them did not have adequate preparation in the English language, the result was disastrous. The students could not integrate the academic material offered, and the institutions could not fulfill their educational obligation.

The difficulties these students bring to an academic situation are complex. Although some students have been in the United States for several years, the student population as a whole has extremely limited skills in both writing and speaking the English language. The generally low income of these individuals, further stressed by financial responsibility here and abroad, has limited their engagement in educational pursuits which would prepare them in this respect. Resources, however, account for only a part of the educational deficit. The academic background of our ESL population, although it may in some cases be equivalent to the requirements for American high school graduation, still does not include certain skills which are needed to compete in our colleges. These skills include inductive inference, techniques of research, basic acquaintance with English and American literature, knowledge of investigative essay presentation, etc.

---

[6]Office of Admissions Services and Office of University Relations, City University of New York, What Does Open Admissions at the City University Mean? (New York: City University of New York, 1973), p.7.

Rationale

We believe that with the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1898[7] the United States became a bilingual nation. At least, it can be argued that this country assumed a moral obligation toward the Spanish-speaking residents of the areas ceded to it under this document. The treaty was clearly intended to safeguard the cultural autonomy of the native populations by guaranteeing their right to retain their culture, language, and religion. Further responsibility toward continuing bilingualism in America was taken on in 1917 when the Jones Act made one million Puerto Ricans actual citizens of the United States even though their culture and language was clearly Hispanic.[8]

It is crucial to note that the United States is one of the few countries in the world in which a man can be considered educated and speak but one language. We might well ask why this is a monolingual country despite the fact that the United States has received millions of people who have spoken all the modern languages of the world. Perhaps, as many have said, it is because this is not a nation but a teeming nation of nations. Consequently, one language was needed to bind different people together. Others have pointed out that the United States is not surrounded by many neighboring countries in which a variety of different languages are spoken. These considerations, however, do not really explain the

---

[7]As a result of the Spanish-American War, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines were ceded to the United States.

[8]H[arold] W[hitman] B[radle]y, "United States: End of Reconstruction and Rise of Industry," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1973.

commitment to monolingualism in this country, nor do they explain the problems which result for the large number of our citizens who have a limited grasp of the one "acceptable" language.

According to the 1960 Census Puerto Ricans represented 7.9% of the total New York City population.[9] It should also be noted that Puerto Ricans are a very recent ethnic group. Most have resided in the continental United States less than fifteen years. There is as yet no established second generation. The 1960 census indicates that 85% of all Puerto Ricans in New York City were under fourteen years of age. At the end of 1971 there were approximately 260,040 Puerto Rican children of school age in the city or approximately 22.8% of the city's total school age population.[10]

The importance of this data to us within the context of the total educational problem is the fact that the great majority of those who will become the second generation are now in the public schools. The kind and type of educational benefits they receive will determine the future of their community. Either they will or will not be able to compete on an equal footing with their fellow citizens for jobs and thus for a productive, satisfying way of life.

---

[9]1960 is the last census year in which Puerto Ricans appear as a separate population entity. The sections of the 1970 census which have been released do not define the Puerto Rican population of New York City. Based on the 1960 census, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has projected a total Puerto Rican population of 730,000 in New York City during the 1970's. This figure is based on an average increase by birth since 1960 plus the percentage of net migration that is estimated to remain in the city. See United States Census of Population 1960, I, Part 34 (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, 1963).

[10]Unless otherwise indicated, any figures of school population presented in this paper are dated 10/30/71, latest census released by the New York City Board of Education at the time this was being written.

Further, contact with the American culture has provided ESL students with limited verbal communicative skills. The skills they do have are usually rooted in colloquial English which, while serving the everyday communicative needs of the students, do not prepare them for the linguistic demands of academic life. Since their daily needs have required minimal written communication, these skills have not been developed. Typically, in any linguistic rating system, these students score proportionately high in verbal communication and extremely low in written communication.

There has been some attempt to alleviate the crisis caused by the sudden influx into the City University of students inadequately prepared both in English and in academic skills. ESL programs and content disciplines conducted in the students' mother tongue have become an integral part of the university curriculum, many times bearing college credits. Existing programs, however, have not met the students' needs.

The development of a bilingual program which seeks to assimilate non-native speaking students into a college curriculum must take all the considerations into account so that it will develop not only linguistic skills but will also introduce students to the other skills mentioned above that they will need to survive in college life. Such a program must be fully integrated as a content subject within the set-up of an institution of higher learning. This should proceed in such a way that the transition from a non-English-speaking to an English-speaking bilingual individual can be made without detriment to the student's academic progress.

The census also demonstrated that the high school's percentages are affected by the vast numbers of drop-outs. Of about 71,000 Puerto Ricans who entered the tenth grade in 1962, only about 44,000 graduated, representing a loss of more than 26,000 students. Some of these students may have transferred to schools outside the city, and some of them may have transferred to private schools, while others may have returned to Puerto Rico; yet we believe that by far the overwhelming number of these students were drop-outs, youngsters who will receive their education on the streets rather then in the city's schools. In the three school years between 1962 and 1965 the New York City high schools lost more than 38% of their Puerto Rican students.

It is important to break down the figures to see how this loss of students from high schools is distributed. It is estimated that of about 6,000 Puerto Rican students who entered the tenth grade in New York City, about 50% were lost by the twelfth grade in September 1964. More than 60% of the students who entered the class of 1965 never graduated. Let us take a close look at the lucky few who did graduate in terms of the academic credentials they received.

Everyone knows the value of an academic diploma. The diploma certifies that one has completed certain courses of study in a curriculum of subjects valued by Western society, subjects like social studies, English, algebra, chemistry, etc. An academic diploma can admit a student to a college if he meets the additional requirements of a particular college.

On the other hand, if one is not college-bound but wishes to start a career in commerce as a secretary, one might aim for a commercial diploma. This diploma indicates that in addition to or in substitution for certain academic courses, other courses in such subjects as shorthand, typing, and other skills necessary to enter the commercial market have been completed. Nevertheless, for many years there was another type of diploma issued by New York City's high schools, the general diploma, which was nothing more than a certificate of attendance that did not even indicate regular attendance. It was frowned upon by business and industry because it was generally known that there was little education backing it.

Fortunately the three-diploma system has been abolished. In September 1973 a new approach was adopted by the New York City high schools. The Board of Education now issues an academic diploma to every high school graduate at the end of a three-year period of study.[11] It is too soon to measure the positive (or negative) effects of this altered policy. The current academic diploma equalizes the credential, but not necessarily the quality of education or the appropriateness of the curriculum to the student's needs.

As these data show, the moral obligation to the educational needs of New York City's Spanish-speaking high school students has not been met. It is important to keep in mind that the more fortunate and tenacious of

---

[11]The most recent statement of graduation requisites can be found in the pamphlet, Requirements for a High School Diploma Effective June, 1974 (New York: New York City Board of Education, 1974).

these students, who do manage to graduate, comprise about one half of the Spanish-speaking population of the city's colleges. College represents the last opportunity society will have to fulfill its obligation to these young people. They will enter the competitive adult world prepared only as society has seen fit to prepare them. Their potential contribution to society is limited to that degree. Others, who enter the colleges from foreign educational backgrounds, will also be limited in their capacity for functioning in and contributing to the culture. Here lies the broad context of a rationale for re-thinking and re-tooling programs for bilingual education.

Listed below are additional specific points which support this rationale:

1. College-level bilingual programs will provide an opportunity for new foreign arrivals to learn and function in English while working toward a college degree.
2. They will serve as a continuum for the existing bilingual programs in the city's public school system.
3. They will provide the opportunity for new foreign arrivals who bring college degrees or college experience from foreign universities to become fluent in the English language, to function in our society, and to utilize previous education. Visits to the various bilingual programs at college level in New York City and part of the eastern areas of New Jersey reveal that a great

number of students participating in them have already had one, two or as many as three years of college education in their native countries.[12]

4. It will enable Spanish-speaking college students residing in the city to become fluent in English, thus creating in them a better self-image and the capacity to participate fully in the new culture they have adopted. It is generally agreed that "in the course of his education a student acquires more than skills and knowledge. He also finds and continues to modify his image of himself, and he shapes his attitudes toward other persons, races, and cultures. Education is therefore responsible for this development of attitudes grounded in self-respect for an understanding of the diversity of American society."[13]

5. They will bring a consequential rise in the aspirational level of the student. Success in education is a positive function of aspiration. Failure increases the probability of lowered aspiration. Travers has noted the important implications of this reality for

---

[12] I would like to thank the following who have been extremely helpful in providing this information: Professor Lourdes Mangual, Assistant Director, Bilingual Institute, Kingsborough Community College; Professor Maria Turpin, Executive Director, Bilingual Program, Essex County College, Newark; and Mr. Alvin Bridgewater, Associate Registrar, Hostos Community College.

[13] Ernece B. Kelly, ed., "Searching for America," Conference on College Composition and Communication (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972), p. xvi.

> the teacher. "In an age when the emphasis in education is on striving for excellence, whatever produces a gross lowering of the level of aspiration does not have a place in education...."[14]

Therefore, we must create bilingual programs at the college level which succeed. We must create bilingual programs which produce men and women who can serve the new nation and society which they have voluntarily adopted. Here lies my rationale for bilingual programs in a university system. Thank you for sharing these ideas with me.

---

[14]Robert M. W. Travers, Essentials of Learning, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1970), p. 195.

Workshop on: "Garnering and Husbanding Fiscal Resources"

Moderator: Carl Bello
Health Manpower Program Specialist
HEW Regional Office
New York, New York

Panelists: Courtney McAnnuff
Director of Financial Aid at SUNY
Farmingdale, New York

Sybil Stevenson
Assistant to Dean
Iona College
New Rochelle, New York

Al Klevan
Program Officer
Bureau of Post Secondary Education
U.S. Office of Education, Region II
New York, New York

Panelist Albert Klevan explained the purposes, availability, and processes of the TRIO Program (Upward Bound, Educational Talent Search, and Special Services to the Disadvantaged and Disabled) and the review process for applications on these programs, which are in line with the objectives of the Statewide Committee on Educational Opportunity (SLEO).

Courtney McAnnuff spoke of the cooperation between his office and the Director of EOP at SUNY, Farmingdale, Mr. Ramon Rodriquez. This relationship, he pointed out, was absolutely necessary for a sound student financial base in these programs. He also expressed some concern over the future findings of Special Programs as they exist today and therefore re-interated the position that Special Programs staff and financial aid staff must work cohesively.

Sybil Stevenson addressed herself to the responsibility of Project Directors to promote and secure financial resources for their programs. Included in this are federal, state, and private resources. Inherent in this process is the necessity of developing institutional relationships with campus financial aid officers and with agencies who are sources of additional funding. In the case of Iona College, she indicated that her functional relationship with the Director of Financial Aid, Mr. Richard Biondi, has enabled Special Program students to maximize their financial support and expedite the subsequent delivery between these offices.

It was resolved that Mr. Courtney McAnnuff and Ms. Sybil Stevenson would co-chair an ad hoc committee which would develop operational guidelines for effective financial assistance programs at Special Program campuses. Such Committee shall be composed of eight members (four from Special Program areas and four Financial Aid Officers). Included in each grouping would be a representative from each of the following sectors: College Discovery, SEEK, HEOP and EOP.

This ad hoc committee would report its findings to the SCEO, Mr. Reeves, President of the NYSFAAA, and the professional associations of Special Program staff. The purpose of these reports would be to promulgate the committee findings to Special Program and Financial Aid personnel.

THE NEED FOR A COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPECIAL PROGRAM STAFF AND THE FINANCIAL AID OFFICE IN ORDER TO GARNER AND HUSBAND RESOURCES

Sybil Jordan Stevenson
Assistant to the Dean
School of Arts and Science
Iona College

Students who qualify for the New York State Opportunity programs are eligible for larger grants from TAP and BEOG than ever before. The availability of these dollars is only a part of their financial aid story. The process of insuring that the funds get to the students is one which demands a close working relationship between the special program staff and the financial aid office. This paper will discuss a model now in operation at Iona College.

Perhaps there are institutions in the state where the aid officer's primary clients are opportunity students. It is hardly the case at Iona College. Therefore, the opportunity program staff provides critical support service for its students. They screen every BEOG, TAP, and PCS/SFS form that our students submit in order to correct errors and/or request additional information. This process assists the aid officer who would have less time to address financial questions if he/she were responsible for making sure that every question is answered, that spelling is correct, signatures and dates are supplied, visa numbers are given, etc. After the aid officer determines that each form is in a shape which will generate the maximum dollars, the opportunity program staff takes on the responsibility of making sure the forms get to the appropriate agency for processing.

Copies are kept for our files and for the aid officer. Mailings are done in bulk with a cover letter indicating the names of the students. A return receipt is requested.

The final step in the process of securing BEOG and TAP funds is the followup. Three checkpoints have been established: November, January and April. At these times a list is compiled of all the aid a student has received. If some grants have not been received, letters are sent from the opportunity program office to the students involved reminding them that the award notices come directly to their addresses and must be brought to the college. The critical question in our query is whether the student has received a request for additional information. If so, what has the student done to honor this request and get the information back to the appropriate agency?

At Iona the opportunity program staff and the financial aid office hold opportunity students strictly accountable for all state and federal grant monies not received as a result of carelessness. A loan or a personal check in the amount the package is short is required before the student may register for the next semester. This policy goes a long way toward enabling students to take seriously the grant application and follow-up process.

The critical issue is that students receive top state and federal dollars so that the necessity for high interest loans is reduced. Project directors and aid officers have the required copies of BEOG and TAP applications on file, yet all students still are not receiving monies because

of a failure to follow through. It's frustrating to have students walk in with bill in hand for $1,000 and more because some expected grant did not come to the student who vaguely remembers getting a letter from Albany or who brought you a copy of his TAP or BEOG form but feels it may have been lost in the mail.

Before we can honestly address the question of new sources of financial aid, we must make sure we have gotten all the available aid to the students which means the process must be monitored from beginning to end. Each campus opportunity director and his/her aid officer should agree upon a procedure which makes appropriate use of each professional's skills and expertise to assist students in taking reasonable responsibility in the aid process. If the opportunity program director and the aid officer are at war, the student loses. We must begin to define the roles of program staff in the aid process. Policies and procedures must be established, agreed upon and carried out by each office. It is not unrealistic to assume that opportunity program staff will need to attend aid workshops to get some clearer understanding of the aid picture and procedures. Aid officers will need to learn about the campus opportunity program, its goals and objectives. As the fiscal picture gets cloudy and hazy with more green forms, at best we must learn to husband resources for our determined, deserving students.

Workshop on: "Improving Curriculum Management"

Moderator: Laurence Martel
Director, Higher Education Opportunity Programs
Syracuse University and Auburn Correctional Facility
Syracuse, New York

Panelists: Albert H. Berrian
Vice President
Institute for Services to Education
Washington, D.C.

Edward K. Donohue
Chairman, Department of Philosophy
Marist College
Poughkeepsie, New York, and
Director, HEOP
Greenhaven Correctional Facility
Greenhaven, New York

Lewis W. Roberts
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Moderator Laurence Martel read the remarks of Dr. Albert H. Berrian, a member of the panel who had to leave before it convened. His remarks focused on the management of the academic curriculum and its interrelatedness to planning.

Dr. Lewis W. Roberts opened his remarks with the comment that administrators cannot realistically manage academic curriculum on an ongoing basis. This becomes the role of the faculty, particularly in planning course content. To illustrate his belief that related courses are not usually coordinated in terms of course content, Dr. Roberts noted the dichotomy between the perspectives of linguists and literature professors.

He pointed out that students must have linguistic ability before they can fully appreciate the value of literature. Dr. Roberts noted that some interrelationship among the courses a student typically carries would facilitate the learning process.

Relating his theory to the special problems of the disadvantaged student, Dr. Roberts pointed out that such an interrelationship would benefit the student by reinforcing the key elements in his different subjects. He characterized this type of learning process as a "program" approach as opposed to the more typical "cafeteria" approach. He also remarked that the non-disadvantaged student, or the student with high academic ability, might be better able to see the interrelationships in his course material on his own.

Dr. Roberts described to the audience an experimental program of this type at his own institution which at the present time involves only freshmen. The focus of the experimental program is to try to develop improved capacity for language and logical thinking.

In reply to a question from Larry Martel, Dr. Roberts defined for the group what he views as the difference between an "interdisciplinary approach" and the "coordinated disciplinary approach" he favors. He described an interdisciplinary approach as one in which the methods and approaches differ from course to course, though they may have some common features, while the coordinated method provides maximum exposure to a disciplined approach in which the student can see different approaches to problem solving.

Larry Martel then posed the following question to the group: How do you manage curriculum to develop and improve it at an institution? A suggestion was made that ideas for improvement must be solicited from faculty and academic officers.

It was noted that there is a point where special curriculum must cease to be a separate entity and must be integrated into the regular curriculum. One member of the audience noted a special problem related to this integration. She mentioned that regular students have begun in some instances to rely on specialists whose primary functions are related to the special programs.

Dr. Edward K. Donohue cautioned that management can become top heavy and that one must not forget that the primary purpose of the institution is education.

The focus of Dr. Donohue's comments was the distinction between motor skills and thinking. He feels that it is essential to remove as much as possible the purely motor aspects of basic skills.

Dr. Harold Delaney mentioned from the audience that many students do not have the personal or academic background to see a value in abstract analysis. It was suggested that there is a need for increased diversification of approaches to meet the needs of different types of students.

The discussion then turned to the essential need for involvement of regular faculty in planning special programs such as opportunity programs. Dr. Delaney emphasized that the programs could be "doomed" without faculty involvement and that cultivation of faculty and their involvement (for example, in an advisory capacity) is essential to the program's success.

In line with this, it was also mentioned that program success is also contingent upon the project director developing contacts with administrators and faculty, and not just on direct access to the chief executive officer.

MANAGING THE ACADEMIC CURRICULUM

Albert H. Berrian
Vice President
Institute for Services to Education

Management of the academic curriculum cannot be separated from its planning. The two functions are not the same, however, although both represent points in a progression that can be described as planning, management and evaluation. Of these three interrelated activities, management presently presents the greatest challenge. It was not always this way. In the not too distant past, planning posed the problem. We have, however, gotten a handle on it, and as a prelude to our discussion of management, let us review what it is that we have gotten a handle on--especially as it pertains to programs servicing students who are not prepared to benefit from traditional academic services.

Where planning was concerned, we learned to assist institutions in the incorporation of non-traditional programs for students with academic deficits into the institution's mission and social and academic goals. Institutional priorities were reorganized as a result of this and an expanded mission incorporated into entire academic programs, as well as into discrete courses. On the non-academic side of this, changes were made in the use of an institution's physical facilities so as to accommodate the needs of non-traditional students. New administrative units were set up, and new financial arrangements resorted to. Bold and innovative instructional methodologies were introduced and attempts made (sometimes with success) to develop more comprehensive performance evaluation systems. Testimony to the success of all

of this finds evidence in academic production as this impacts positively on non-traditional students and the recorded high percentage of such students who go on to graduate and professional schools. By and large, programs designed for the non-traditional students with academic and related deficits have been successful and have had a spin-off in the improvement of services delivered to more traditional students. These programs can be rendered more successful by more efficient management.

One might argue that the specification of institutional (broadly-defined) mission, goals and objectives belongs to the planning rather than the management aspect of the planning, management and evaluation progression. When one places emphasis on the word specification, a transition is, in fact, being made into the management task. The case is similar in the development of alternative policies or approaches to the realization of specified goals and objectives. Here the transition comes from an underlining of the terms alternative and realization. We are into management proper with the adoption of a plan for those responsible for policy-making and policy implementation for the achievement of goals and more immediate objectives. Here, kindly underscore adopt(ion), implement(ation) and acnieve(ment). The characterization of management is relatively complete when one adds the follwoing to the above:

1. The outlining of processes and procedures (including the setting up of lines of communicating and reporting) that will facilitate the implementation of the plan;
2. The setting up of time-targets for the meeting of goals and objectives explicit in the plan;

3. The fixing of responsibility for the monitoring and assessment of the plan and associated processes and procedures including the design and setting into operation of a data processing system;
4. The analysis of data and communication of data findings to decision makers, with recommendations as needed, for refinements in the plan.

It goes without saying, that the plan grows out of the necessary needs assessment, both in terms of the institution's personal, physical and human resources and the students' personal, social and academic characteristics.

There is some question in my mind as to whether the implementation of management phenomena (as described above) extends into an institution's service courses in general, not to mention those developmental and remedial courses designed to upgrade the psycho-social and study habits and cognitive skills of non-traditional students with deficits. There are, of course, individual differences among institutions, and so I speak here in generality. What is being said here may not be true of courses for majors, which we are excluding here from the service course (general education and developmental or remedial course) category. The statement below was prepared for researchers and data gatherers who deal with students being served by developing institutions. With some modifications, this same statements can be of use to those operational units within traditional institutions which collectively represent a school within a school designed to meed the needs of developing students.

Curricula for non-traditional students with special deficits should be placed under careful management. Placing them thus should, of course, come after the objectives of each course in the general education program have been spelled out and the effectiveness of the courses measured in terms of their producing desired behavioral changes in students. It goes without saying, that the course objectives referred to must be consistent with the academic mission and goals of each institution in question.

In more specific terms, curriculum management includes fixing ultimate responsibility for curricular processes and outcomes with the chief academic officer or an affiliated officer. He or she would see to it that curricular goals and objectives are kept consistent with the institutional mission and goals and that the teaching-learning process takes place within the approved limits of institutional policy and directives. Provision for pre-service arrangments in connection with faculty and curriculum development would be made in the office of the chief academic officer. Provision for pre-service arrangements in connection with faculty and curriculum development would be made in the office of the chief academic officer. This person would be kept informed of the content, structure and use of student records in the developmental process.

General records would include a description of programs and strategies used to assist the student in acquiring attitudes germane to the academic and occupational success and generic competencies central to their preparation for post-baccalaureate or other upper-level study. Evaluative techniques will also be described, as well as the use of evaluative information. Recommendations for methodological changes, for program modifications and for budgets may come upward to the chief academic officer, but he must accept primary monitoring and advocacy responsibilities.

The processes and procedures described should be set into motion so as to provide a sound basis for upper-level program administration as this affects the non-traditional student. In addition, conditions must be set for the utilization of the Institutional Reasearch Office (or that office which subsumes responsibilities normally assigned to institutional research offices) for upgrading academic decision-making.

Another way of looking at program management is through the defining of roles and responsibilities for program implementation. One of the best appraoches to this is described in Medgar Evers College's Competency-Based Teacher Education, Vol. I, pp. 50-51. There, and in connection with the development and implementation of a competency-based teacher program, statements of role expectations were arrived at by consensus. Consensus was reached during periodic meetings called for the purpose of developing and clarifying all components of the program under development. The key roles that individuals were to fulfill in the maintenance of the program were carefully delineated.

Formulation of roles and responsibilities were predicated upon Public Administration theory, which focuses on man, the job, and the effect when terminal objectives are considered. "The deployment of personnel listed...was conceptualized as being systemic or designed to achieve desired goals by the patterning of crucial linkages." These linkages allowed each individual to function within the stipulated role definition on both an individual and group basis.

It seemed fitting to conclude this statement with reference to an in-state model. And with this, best of luck at this advanced stage of special program implementation.

ON IMPROVING CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT

Lewis Roberts
Foreign Languages and Literature
Syracuse University

My agreement with Dr. Berrian's position on curriculum management extends very far, but I do not agree that ultimate responsibility for the curriculum rests with the administration. Rather this responsibility rests with the learning community. I view any institution involved in education as a community of learners, some of whom also teach. The involvement with intellectual growth never ceases. And the course of this involvement, the "running of the course" of intellectual involvement is the meaning of "curriculum." Hence, I prefer not to speak of "management" of "curriculum." For the jargon of the business world tends to perpetuate the mistake of making academic decisions on economic grounds. To continue to apply the conceptual framework of the economic institution to the academic world is as serious a mistake as booking an ocean crossing on the Titanic.

Organizational problems in curriculum must be seen in proper context. The explosion of both disciplines and knowledge since the 1930's has made a mess of curriculum control. Let me illustrate with one example: that of language study.

The variety of language components within college and university departments has its genesis in the conventional division between language and literature and the vacillating attitude of philosophy or linguistics

towards the universality or differences of languages. In periods of humanistic culture an emphasis on the community of all languages prevailed. In the 1930's to the 1960's emphasis was on the system of each particular language. The inevitable debate about the nature of the intellect produced uncertainty. Was the aim of language study to produce fluent speakers and/or writers or was it to use the language as a vehicle for illustrating human nature through its most characteristic ability? The uncertainty of whether language study owes allegiance to the philosopher or the linguist continues. Departments of English tend to continue the pattern of literary specialization and at the same time endeavor to ensure standards of meaning. But the emphasis has so shifted to literature that high status is associated with teaching advanced literature courses, while composition is relegated to junior faculty. In the foreign language class the divorce between the language and the literature has so grown that some departments do much of their teaching in English in courses in literature in translation. The divorce has led to ignoring the basic problem. The language is a barrier to understanding the literature. This barrier is too often crossed by ignoring it rather than by confrontation. Most students, for example, simply do not have the vocabularly to read Shakespeare intelligently, let alone Spenser or Chaucer.

The divorce between language and literature in language departments illustrates the basic problem in curriculum control. There is almost a total lack of reinforcement. This lack often hits harder the special opportunity student, who has been deprived of many common educational ex-

periences: A core or patterned curriculum in which basic skills are reinforced is one way to meet the problem and overcome the isolation of disciplines and classes. A coordinated disciplinary approach is not "interdisciplinary." Classes which have the same set of students are taught in different departments. Thus the student shares the same experience with a number of peers in courses in, say, languages, history, philosophy, and hopefully, science. The teachers teach their discipline; but they are also aware of what is going on in the other courses. Papers can be exchanged; transfer of learning can be facilitated. The ability of the students to express themselves in both oral and written discourse becomes the responsibility of the "curriculum" and not just of Freshman English. The "course of study" becomes related and the relationships enhance and reinforce the experience.

With the support of a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities one such pilot program with two options for freshmen is being tried at Syracuse University. It grew as one direct response to an exhaustive study of the freshman experience. This planning grant entails the possibility of developing a program which will encompass more than just a few students.

As colleges and universities are forced to trim budgets and as legislatures are increasingly unwilling to fund special programs to bring numbers of students to college, integrating educational opportunity programs withing the regular structure of the institution becomes more and more a question of survival. Any effort at building faculty support for

such a move is worthwhile. Such efforts, however, will be more successful if they are coupled with plans to integrate the special students into programs which are likely to facilitate their academic success. A coordinated - disciplinary curriculum is one such program.

LOGIC FOR A COHERENT CURRICULUM

Edward W. Donohue
Chairman, Department of Philosophy
Marist College

In 1968, when the economy was healthier than it is today and representatives of industry flocked to campuses to recruit graduating seniors, a meeting of 15 recruiters and Marist's department chairpersons was arranged by our career placement officer. At the meeting, a chairman asked the recruiters to list the greatest weaknesses of the students that they had interviewed over the years. One responded and the rest concurred, that the students could not read, could not write and could not speak.

They attempted to console us by adding that this was not a problem indigenous to Marist but was true of students on all the campuses they visited. We were overwhelmed: students who were completing our carefully organized curriculum couldn't read, write or speak.

Today, colleges across the country are trying to deal with this problem in various ways, but cutting through the diverse methods of improving the indicated "skills" is, very often, a single, dominant presupposition. Basic skills are frequently treated as though they were motor skills.

We often find that writing, speaking, reading, math and science are taught very much the same way that a child is taught to walk, ride a bicycle, dribble a basketball: demonstration, practice through drill, evaluation, correction, more practice, etc. This method is effective for certain aspects of these skills because certain functions, once learned

and understood, must be habitualized. One need not always attend to the Distributive Law when multiplying simple numbers, nor to syntactic, diagrammatic schemata when speaking, writing, or reading a sentence. Nevertheless, language, mathematics, science are ways of THINKING and thinking is surely not a motor skill. When that recruiter said that students could not read, he did not mean that they could not translate what they saw on a printed page into the appropriate vocal sounds. He meant that the students could not grasp the essential point the writer was making and how he arrived at his conclusion and whether or not the journey toward the conclusion was properly made.

My own experience with students confirms the recruiters' impressions. Shortly after the meeting, I distributed, in one of my classes, copies of an edited passage from one of Herbert Marcuse's works. The paragraph argues to a specific point but, though purporting to be a conclusion of a carefully reasoned argument, the formal structure of the argument is logically invalid and no conclusion may be inferred. I asked the students to identify the skeleton of the argument, and to determine whether or not it was well made. The students ignored my question and generally claimed that they liked the passage and agreed with the author.

There are certain statements within the passage that are well written. Several analogies are quite vivid and the illustrations are striking. Many students related positively to these, ignored the reasoned argument and simply claimed that they liked it. They reacted to the document very much the way they might react to food--I like french fries, pickles and the

selection from Marcuse. This "thinking with the skin" takes an objective statement, capable of being evaluated by public evidence and the criteria of logical form, and reduces it to an inscrutable, indiputable private affair--I like it and chacun a son gout.

What is said here of reading is also true of writing, math, speaking, and science. Students who don't know how to read, write or speak, don't know how to think linguistically. Students who don't know "how to do" math or science don't know how to think mathematically or scientifically.

Thought, conceptualization, idea are born simultaneously with the emergence of the symbol. One does not first think and subsequently express the thought in a symbolic form; the thought lives with the symbol. When symbols are structured within a specific system, thought is channeled and moves within the boundaries established by that system. Thought is organized differently through diverse symbol systems. There are discursive symbol structures that include language, mathematics, and science and nondiscursive systems that include art and ritual.

Formal logic identifies and analyzes the patterns that underlie the syntax of Western Indo-European languages and this activity is nothing less than the examination of the Western modes of thought. It engages the question: How does the Western mind work? Students of formal logic are learning how to think. The ability to think can only result in speaking and writing that is coherent. It also culminates in reading and listening that is active. Students are enabled to actively seek out the central

point that the author or speaker is attempting to make, to identify the statements that claim to support that conclusion and to evaluate the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the structure of the entire process.

Learning how to think is essesntial to the success of any curriculum. Since thinking is not merely a kinesthetic operation but rather the movement of concept-symbols in specific and identifiable patterns, the study of those patterns is the fundamental ingredient for the successful organization of any curriculum.

Perhaps some who have been exposed to logic courses have found them too abstract, too lofty and as inapplicable to their everyday thinking as the quadratic formula. Such courses often treated logic as a kind of pseudo-mathematics. But logic need not be taught and learned that way. Logic can require students to examine, for coherent structure, statements culled from books, periodicals, newspapers, speeches, advertisements and the like. It can call on students to compose, in writing or in speech, themes, positions, reports that are organized around predetermined logical structures. Such a course or course sequence can allow a student to discern the basic structural principles that distinguish discursive thinking in language, mathematics and science from nondiscursive thinking in art and ritual.

Workshop on: "Improving Reading/Skills"

Moderator: Harry Franklin
Director, HEOP
Malcolm King College
New York, New York

Panelists: Jane Paznik-Bongarin
Assistant Professor of English
Manhattan Community College
New York, New York

Carol Douglas Stevens
Director of Study Skills
Malcolm King College
New York, New York

IMPROVING STUDENT EFFECTIVENESS IN WRITING SKILLS: WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR THEM AND FOR US?

Jane Paznik-Bondarin
Manhattan Community College, CUNY

The literature on the problems of the goals, methods, and content of college composition--remediation being only the last course added to the curriculum--is as old as the subject itself. We ask of ourselves something impossible: full knowledge, in advance, of what to do and why. It is an understandable question, however, because our work involves other people--students. The impossibility and understandability being so, if we are going to look for end-in-view guides, perhaps the best is William James's pragmatism, which would admonish us to keep doing something as we acquire more and better knowledge; to seek our knowledge from the relationships that obtain within the teaching-learning process itself; and, most important, to see what difference one way of doing something makes as opposed to another. I explore the question of consequences, entailing objectives and methods, by elaborating on Chomsky's notions of performance and competence: Performance is the actual use of language that we hear and read; competence is the underlying, rule-governed basis of performance (intuition) that we can tap only by questioning.

The primary goal of developmental composition is itself pragmatic. Writing is a performance skill, and our main objective is or should be to increase students' ability to perform in standard English or Edited American English (EAE) grammatical usage and rhetorical style. We may want to

argue, at some later date, when our students have the same skills we do, whether or not there is such a thing as standard English or EAE. It is a worthy argument because of the fluid nature of language, but academic (pardon the pun) to our students at their present skill level. The handouts before you are student papers written by freshman at Borough of Manhattan Community College. Some of them illustrate both grammatical usage and rhetorical style that, I think we can agree, are neither academic nor business EAE, and I think we are obligated to teach what we know as EAE, unless we are willing to make certain kinds of societal judgements (for instance, that the students do not need to know it or that they will not be called upon to use it in the jobs they will pursue) which I, for one, am not willing to make. Should we be so tempted, the students instruct us. In my second year at BMCC, I gave a class a practice reading exam--at their insistence--one that has a collection of abstruse and challenging vocabulary items. After the test, I remarked that the students didn't really need to worry about the vocabulary items as they would likely not encounter them again. One student asked if I knew the majority of the words. I perused them and said yes. He replied that so long as that was true he'd appreciate it if I'd just teach <u>everything</u> and let <u>him</u> decide if it was relevant.

The primary goal being performance, the primary method is to strengthen competence. Students come to us speaking and writing in dialects other than EAE; they are not blank slates on which EAE can be written. We deal with men and women who, for the most part, possess a highly developed sense of language, an ability to evaluate language usage, and some definite

rhetorical preferences. This is their present competence, but they may be uncertain about their intuitions, their attitudes having been negatively reinforced. It is our job to elicit and solidify the students' intuitions and compare and contrast them with rules of EAE. If we fail to bring the student's intuitions about language to consciousness, we pay a price for continuing the negative reinforcement. We may be able to teach performance in EAE, although not as well because EAE will remain an overlay to students' previous knowledge. We will not, however, have gone to the heart of language and will not, thus, have been fully responsible to our students. However we need not fail! Increasingly, linguists and ethographers describe and codify dialects other than EAE. Educators structure programs or suggest possibilities for using this knowledge to bridge what the sutdents already know with what we attempt to teach.[1] The students themselves provide data, if we listen and are awake to the possibilities.

---

[1]See William Labov, Paul Cohen, Clarence Robins, and John Lewis, A Study of the Non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City (2 vols. Final Report Cooperative Research Project No. 3288, U.S. Office of Education, 1968) for a compendium of grammatical and narrative features; Milton Baxter,"Educating Teachers about Educating the Oppressed," Florida FL Reporter 12 (Spring/Fall 1974):77-80, for a discussion of the sociolinguistic factors affecting teaching EAE; Claudia Mitchell, "Language Behavior in a Black Urban Community" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1969) for an analysis of speech events in the black community; Carol Reed, Paul Cohen, Milton Baxter, Samuel Moore, and Jaqueline Redrick, "For Teaching Standard English Writing to Speakers Showing Black English Influences in Their Writing" (Lanugage Curriculum Research Group, Department of Educational Services, Brooklyn College, 1972 [mimeograph]), the only text in the area for college students; and Jane Paznik, "The Artistic Dimension of Black English: A Disclosure Model and Its Implications for Curriculum and Instruction" (Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1976) for a model for explaining rhetorical styles and suggestions for their use in educational settings.

The consequences of an elicitation/contrastive analysis approach are important. For example, several years ago a student in whose class I had used this approach returned to tell me a story about an incident in her speech class. She had delivered a speech which was evaluated very favorably by the instructor with one small correction: the student had used the words "their self," which the instructor said did not exist. The student recounted that she listened carefully and responded that it was indeed the instructor's prerogative to find the usage unacceptable in a formal speech--it had been unintentional on the student's part to begin with--but not to say that the words did not exist; they did exist both by virtue of coinage and by their productive use in the student's own dialect and other related ones.

This response bespeaks a student at full strength. The student is performing, for the most part, in EAE; she has the competence to code-switch at will (either by a process of self-editing or because her intuitions are incorporating EAE); and, just as important, she is aware of what she is doing. She can add to her knowledge of language without surrendering or denigrating what she had before and the identity that that conferred on her. As an intellectual consequence of learning to write EAE by the elicitation/contrastive analysis approach, this cultural freeing and linking is no mean thing. It is a consequence I do not see in other approaches. And all the while the student has been able to operate from a basis of strength.

The consequences for teachers of adopting an elicitation/contrastive analysis approach are equally revealing. Teachers must retrain themselves to be the urban language specialists advocated in the 1974 CCCC resolution.[2] We also have to cede the privileged positions of unchallenged experts because the students will be giving us new data. The roles of teachers and students become reciprocal and mutually informing.

It may sound as if I've talked about goals and methodology at the expense of content; to the contrary, the elicitation/contrastive analysis approach makes language the content of the writing class. Students who need to learn EAE grammar can contrast its rules with those of their own grammar, researching and discussing the historical, geographical, and/or social components of both, and trace the development in both by their interplay within the English language system. The study of rhetorical style can entail literary models that illustrate the students' modes as well as alternative modes--showing the variety of ways to advance an argument and suggesting possibilities of incorporating elements of one mode into another. Here again there are consequences for teachers and students. For the students, they can gain performance proficiency in EAE as they gain a new awareness of their own powers and simultaneously locate themselves and others culturally within the language. For all of us, the language is enriched by the fusing of styles.

---

[2]Committee on CCCC Language Statement, "Students' Right to Their Own Language," College Composition and Communication 24, special issue (Fall, 1974).

We come full circle with Jamesian pragmatism. Using the elicitation/contrastive analysis approach, we can keep on teaching while we acquire new knowledge about the students' use of language which will advance our work; we gain insight into this by changing the relationships that obtain within the teaching-learning process and need not go outside it for data; and our method seems to make a difference: the difference of enhanced proficiency in EAE simultaneous with firmer competence and an increase in the beauty of language based on cultural/linguistic contributions.

My remarks, of necessity, have been brief and general. I invite you to look at the handouts and explore this approach with me in more detail. Thank you.

MOTIVATION AND ACHIEVEMENT IN A COLLEGE READING AND STUDY SKILLS COURSE

Carol Douglas Stevens
Malcolm-King: Harlem College Extension

A course in reading on the college level operates under conflicting assumptions--that students know how to read, and that students do not know how to read. Instructors, faced with the seemingly impossible task of raising student's reading to college level in one semester, plead for longer hours and more semesters. Many students, coming from histories of remedial reading, see the course as another useless exercise or another source of stigma.

Motivation in a college reading course must be related to the acquisition of freedom--freedom to read a textbook or whatever the student chooses. The goal of the course must be to assist students in succeeding with their content courses not in raising grade level five points.

What does a grade level on a standardized test mean for a college student? Actually, it means very little. It is impossible to determine the ability of a student on the basis of one test. Many variables account for the wrong answers on an objective reading test. Teacher-made diagnostic tools and observation of progress toward stated goals are more revealing.

The act of reading proceeds from listening, discriminating, deciphering, and then understanding and interpreting. In the beginning stages the student must sound out words to gain meaning. Most students entering a college program can grasp the meanings of groups of words without

sounding them out. These students are ready to practice and improve vocabulary building and interpretive skills. For those who may sometimes regress to the primary stages, phonics and more basic reading skills may have to be reviewed. But, even for these students whose reading scores fall lowest on the scale, grade level may not be truly reflective of their potential. I saw an example of this in one of my students who came with very poor reading and writing skills. She could converse logically and intelligently; however, her writing resembled a child's. She became frustrated when asked to read aloud and would skip over or invent words she did not know. Teachers had decided she was definitely not college material. After three semesters of work beginning with a very basic reading course, progressing to a more difficult course and then to individualized tutoring, she scored on the eightieth percentile of a college normed test and passed a comprehensive writing examination. The student realized that the self discipline necessary to overcome those barriers of non-learning were essential to her freedom. She was able to use the experience and skills acquired from years of compensation to conquer the written word and fill in the learning gaps. This leap cannot be measured or defined in terms of grade level.

Individualization is an integral part of a college reading program. Some programs operate entirely from the laboratory approach. Students work independently assisted by tutors. Prescriptive guides are developed based on diagnostic information. This may take the form of a learning

contract which is an excellent motivational device. Students may chart their own progress; it may be done by tutors or by a computer. One to one conferences with teachers or tutors are also important.

Other colleges offer freshmen reading courses that are classroom based but supplemented by individualized laboratory work. These courses are becoming the trend around the country since it has become evident that not only the disadvantaged need to sharpen reading skills. A freshmen reading course can be beneficial to all students regardless of reading level. Instructors must select and emphasize those reading and study skills which will equip the student to pass his courses. The reading course itself can be used as a diagnostic instrument to determine specific gaps in students' learning. The individualization process begins here but may have to continue beyond the confines of a semester. If the student has seized control of his own learning process and is well motivated, he will proceed independently in a followup laboratory environment.

At Malcolm-King College we use the classroom appraoch followed and supplemented by the laboratory approach. Behavioral objectives and minimal mastery standards are set for all reading and study skills deemed most important. After one semester of classroom instruction, students complete unfinished objectives in the reading lab. We are now in the process of developing a diagnostic test based on the skills we have taught in our freshmen courses. In the area of reading and study skills, they are the following:

1. Listening and Notetaking
2. Finding the Main Idea and Details
3. Vocabulary in Context
4. Making Inferences and Judgements
5. Summarizing and Outlining
6. Interpreting Tone and Intent

These skills are taught through a variety of methods and materials. If students can see a direct relationship between these skills and success in their content courses, motivation will be strengthened. In fact, the most helpful situation would be to have students take a content course in conjunction with the skills course. The instructor may begin with simple, highly relevant and interesting material. As soon as concepts are acquired, they should be applied to the students' own textbooks. Oral discussions are useful since students tend to hesitate in interpreting and criticizing the authoritative written word, but feel freer to use these skills verbally. This, in turn, must be transferred to silent reading.

Listening and notetaking skills are difficult to teach because they involve many biases. One method is to present short lectures on various topics and have students practice by taking notes and summarizing what was said. In the beginning, students may be given partially completed outlines which would offer structure for notetaking and help develop the skill of outlining. It would also reinforce the skills of determining the main idea and details.

Within the context of either the classroom approach or the laboratory approach, attention should be given to two factors which may have an effect on motivation. They are students' study habits and attitudes toward study; and students' cognitive styles.

The freshmen college reading course is a vital force in any college program. It must be carefully and systematically designed as a supplier of college coping skills, and as a motivating diagnostic and prescriptive tool for students who must strive beyond its limits to fill in gaps in their learning.

Workshop on: "Effective Diagnostic Testing"

Moderator: Eloise Dowdell
Director, HEOP
Ithaca College
Ithaca, New York

Panelists: Gladys Abraham
Coordinator Summer HEOP
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rochester, New York

Edward Jenkins
Director EOP
SUNY at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Karl Schumacher
Coordinator of Supportive Services
Utica College of Syracuse University
Utica, New York

Katharine Webb
Department of Counselor Education
State University College, Brockport
Brockport, New York

EFFECTIVE DIAGNOSTIC TESTING

Karl Schumacher
Coordinator of Supportive Services
Utica College

The composition of the agenda and workshops at conferences such as these supply evidence as to what concerns and priorities we hold fundamental. It is a positive sign that this conference has turned its perspective inward to the nuts and bolts of our program operations. I would suggest that the focus of this workshop, diagnostic testing, is the central axis for academic and supportive services to revolve around. Unfortunately, it is the least utilized and understood type of testing.

Three reasons seem to emerge as obstacles to effective diagnostic testing. First, the precise definition of "diagnostic" is often blurred with other concepts associated with the term. Second, most individuals, including many with test usage background, are not trained sufficiently in the area. Third, outside the areas of reading and math few diagnostic tests exist. The overall impact of these prohibitive influences on diagnostic testing is that, even with the best intentions, we are often like blind men and women punching wildly in the dark at the specific learning problems of our students.

What does diagnosis mean? Quite simply it is the process of determining the nature of a disability or disorder. "Nature" cannot be read to mean simply "existence." Many tests exist whose aims are to quantify the present level of a general skill (e.g., reading, basic mathematics operations, English usage).

Low performance on any general test of ability, whether achievement, aptitude, survey or others, often implies the existence of a skill deficiency. It is incorrect to say, however, that poor performance represents a skill deficiency. If we define a skill as a developed ability acquired in stages, then we may speak of skill-related and non-skill-related performance factors. For instance, inability to read or interpret an exam or to perform the operations (after being exposed to them) necessary to answer test items represent skill-related problems. Anxiety in the test situation, a biased instrument, or non-exposure to test material are non-skill-related factors.

Diagnostic testing recognizes that general skills or abilities are composed of sub-skills, that these sub-skills are acquired in a roughly sequential pattern, and that the acquisition of lower level sub-skills facilitates the development of more comprehensive skills. Diagnostic testing then is the fine art of focusing on specific dysfunctions in sub-skill areas.

The skill of reading supplies us with a concrete example. To read, we must accurately perceive graphic symbols (letters) which represent sounds. We are then required to silently blend into a word and attach meaning to it. Words must be blended into though units (i.e., phrases, s-v units, sentences. Higher levels of reading require main point-detail structuring, use of connotative meaning, etc., etc. If a person can read, these sub-skills are natural and hidden. If one cannot read, learning to do so is similar in sub-skill approach to breaking down a golf swing or tennis stroke.

In truth, few diagnostic tests are available. Diagnostic tests in reading are most numerous but they are frequently uninteresting or non-applicable to college-age students. Though the need is obvious, little has developed in the diagnostic field. Problems surface with test-makers, users, and the diagnostic concept itself.

Test-makers realize that a good diagnostic test must accurately identify and test the inclusive sub-skills of a particular ability. Rarely is there uniform agreement in the academic world as to which sub-skills are necessary and in what order they occur. Therefore, any diagnostic test published under one "school" of skill acquisition will not satisfy individuals holding contrary viewpoints. This limits the marketability and appeal of the instruments.

Another impediment arises in constructing a reliable diagnostic instrument. A general skill frequently consists of twenty or more sub-skills. Each of these smaller abilities must be measured accurately by using an appropriate number of test items. A problem becomes apparent. The length of the resulting test, to insure consistent measurement, frustrates the tester and testee alike.

Another issues of concern is the diagnostic strategy itself. It is an expensive and time-consuming practice when executed properly. Diagnostic test scores are really only one factor of many in any conclusion involving skill deficiencies. A physical testing component for vision, hearing, and sensorimotor coordination is often vital. Motivation, career, and interest testing lend added insight to the individual's <u>style of learning</u>.

What to do? The problem simply stated: We need better diagnostic strategies to focus on the learning problems of our students, but good insturments appropriate to our population are virtually nil.

At this juncture, I would suggest developing your own instruments. The construction should be undertaken by an individual familiar with the diagnostic process. The paradigm for diagnosis of acquired skills remains the same across skills as well as content areas. That is, identification and determination of sub-skill ability.

First, broaden the definition of "skill" to include content areas. Thus we may speak of a student as possessing economics "skill" or physics "skill." Second, identify, with the help of academic departments, the mental operations necessary for comprehension of the topic. For example, past achievement provides some diagnostic information in determining whether the student has evidenced any facility in subject. This, however, is but one small piece of information. Using economics to illustrate, we can expand the notion. A college student needs to be able to read, to visualize (create mental pictures of written or verbal messages), to interpret graphs, to categorize, and to comprehend marginal concepts to name a <u>few</u> skills necessary to pass economics. A student's visualizing ability, graph reading etc., can be checked out in an informal, non-threatening setting with a counselor or in a more formalized test situation. The point is that, in addition to simple memory of course content, mental abilities which are applicable across many content areas can be identified, isolated, and <u>qualitatively</u> judged.

I have, on more than one occasion, been amazed to find that a student could not perform a mental task (i.e., alphabetizing same-first-letter words which is taken absolutely for granted by almost everyone else). Frequently the student realizes this deficiency exists and is deeply embarrassed about it. In a task such as the above, the consequences of the inability may not be severe. Given an inability more central to a course area, the consequence could be failure.

In summary, then, diagnostic testing seeks to identify sub-skills which are not necessarily content-related. A skill or sub-skill may better be described as the cognitive capacity in a person to shift and sort information into different forms and/or patterns. Until we determine our students' capacity to do this over a wide range of information and circumstances, we will have few specific clues as to why performance is poor.

Workshop on: "Orienting Students to Campus Resources"

Moderator: Vernon Buck
Director, EOP
State University of New York
Albany, New York

Panelists: Elizabeth Mills
Equal Opportunity Employment Officer
State University College, Brockport
Brockport, New York

Leroy Mitchell
Director, HEOP
Canisius College
Buffalo, New York

Roberta Vogel
Director, College Discovery Program
College of Staten Island, CUNY
Staten Island, New York

EFFECTIVE ORIENTATION OF OPPORTUNITY STUDENTS

Elizabeth Mills
Equal Opportunity Employment Officer
State University College at Brockport

Effective orientation of Opportunity students remains one of the most elusive components of HEOP-EOP-SEEK programs (in New York State).

College administrators, program staff, and often, community organizations have exchanged ideas and expertise each year in this decade with little or no agreement that any particular model is adequate.

Some of the programs have structured elaborate and extensive academic and social experiences which engage the students during the full year--providing high impact for the college community and the students. Others rely upon "low profile" samplings of the college experience: scheduling time-bound microcosms of academic and the environment--which they hope will be authentically duplicated in the reality of a typical college day.

Such models continue to be redesigned (sometimes annually) so it is evident to me that while we are in agreement that orientation is of great value, we need to continue to explore and discuss more effective ways to insure that we achieve the goals of successful matriculation and graduation for our students...most of whom require sustained support.

Earning a degree and feeling confident that some competence has been achieved has finally become the rule, not the exception, for our students.

The recent Office of Civil Rights report (locally released in the press: 10/28/76) proclaims a significant increase in the enrollment of minority students in American colleges and universities. We know that the

11.7% increase reported for the two-year period (1972-1974) would indeed be doubled or perhaps tripled if we could have retained more of the Opportunity Program students who were admitted during that same two-year period.

As an Affirmative Action Officer, introduced to the State University of New York system as a counselor in one of the urban Special Programs, the issue of "mainstreaming" minority students continues to be of great importance to me. I find that one of the greatest tools in retaining minority group and female faculty, staff, and students, is providing realistic, thorough introduction to the expectations and routines of the college and, at the same time, an accurate introduction and interpretation of the employees' goals and aspirations.

This means that my work is truly a negotiation-role consciously and deliberately worked on "both-sides-of-the-street" (so to speak). Consider the difference in impact alone when you consider an approach toward problem-solving for a student: if you say: Susie expects to pass this course--and if you say: Susie expects to graduate.

I am suggesting, as you have probably guessed, that we have been correct in our advocacy role, but perhaps short-sighted in our interpretation of the clients' goals and the campuses' responsibilities!

Some of the basic understandings--as I hold such for orientation--and proper use of resources at the campuses are these: at the baseline, we are providing experiences that produce a good presentation of self--a kind of confidence-building and development of self-assurance which becomes personalized and individualized--a dynamic that does not rely upon

group confrontation and peer pressure. Such focusing on individual needs and goals must continue to be related to the interest of the larger group--and must move away from crisis-intervention, short-term problem-solving, to the pervasive, consistent movement toward successful personal engagement of our educational system.

What is the transition? Give up--Take in. We ask students to "give up" most of their former behavior, lifestyles, and problem-solving methods, and to take advantage of the resources on campus. If this is so, then let's maximize the service delivery.

1. Know the resources, formal & informal, tradtional and new ones; work for the organization of unusual, but really helpful resources.
2. Acquire and continue current knowledge of changes in the philosophy, personnel and budget allocations of campus organization's goals.
3. Participate in the network...know service providers by name as well as function.
4. Request feedback from students; give and respond to the resources ...say "thanks" for a job well done.

In 1973, 43,000+ minority students were enrolled in New York State colleges and universities--3,900 of the students acquired bachelor's degrees; it is reported that 2/3 of the remaining students require sustained support.

This support, of course, reaches well beyond financial security. The engagement and full utilization of resources must include every facet of

college life...the students must present themselves with confidence and clearly stated ultimate goals; we must represent them as "consumers" prepared to utilize effectively everything in the system--toward their successful departure from it.

GENERAL SESSION III - SUMMARY

Topic: "Developing Educational Opportunity in the World of Work"

Moderator: Noel Palmer
Director
EOC
Long Island, New York

Panelists: Jerome E. Barton
Manager, Special Projects
International Telephone and Telegraph

James L. D'Acosta
Program Manager & Affirmative Action Recruiter
General Electric Company

Catherine Farrell
LaGuardia Community College, CUNY
New York, New York

Delores Schultz
Training Center Administrator
New York Telephone Company

James L. D'Acosta, Representative of General Electric Company, emphasized that the company is a business and any educational benefits are only a sideline. Hiring of students during summer takes place only as needed, and these, who are usually engineering students, often remain as full-time employees after graduation. High school/college students also participate on a "co-op" basis. There are approximately 1,000 students participating in apprentice programs which cover a wide diversity of

training which includes courses that count toward degrees, or which may or may not be taught "in-house." Primary interest is in technology and business students. It is important for educators to stress the importance of becoming contributing members of society by inculcating, as much as possible, the proper motivating attitude.

Catherine Farrell, LaGuardia Community College. Most of these students form a heterogeneous body, many of whom are returning adults, providing a challenge to the faculty to provide feasible, viable jobs-through-training. Ninety percent are involved in work/pay experiences, critical to the "new" student. College is a looking for exposure, a broadening of life experience, for those who have never had much interchange with the world of work. There would be no program without internships. Essential elements in this program are:

1. Learning to cope with the threatening aspect of work.
2. Growing in motivation through experience.
3. Achieving in work setting due to the often disregarded past work experience.
4. Structuring objectives for developmental growth, both personal and educational.
5. Advising before and during internship.
6. Seminars including representatives of work establishment.

It is a challenge to integrate technical skills into the broader picture of living/working in industry.

Thomas Leach, Brooklyn Educational Opportunity Center. The Brooklyn EDC has been involved as a training agent in Bedford-Stuyvesant district for a long time. It offers nine (9) vocational programs and the average age of its students is 28.

Procedures:

1. Interview of student to discuss vocational goals which do often change. (Watch-dog practice)
2. Resume is developed which is helpful to both the student and future personnel officers.
3. Student advisors prepare students for selling themselves as future employees. Also, test-taking techniques are taught.
4. Realistic counseling of employment situation occurs.
5. Teacher evaluations are on-going to build skills continually.
6. Liaison continues with business world outside EDC.
7. Placement officers start communication with each student within the first two weeks of training.

NEW YORK TELEPHONE COMPANY

Delores Schultz
Training Center Administrator
New York Telephone Company

New York Telephone became actively involved in educational programs in the later part of the sixties. At that time we were faced with the problem of obtaining qualified people. The New York Metropolitan area had undergone an employment transition which had serious effects on the ability of business to recruit adequate numbers of qualified employees. Added to this was the growing number of qualified employees. Added to this was the growing number of high school dropouts and general diploma graduates who were entering the labor market ill-prepared to pass most employment tests or if they did qualify on our entrance test, many of the new urban hires lacked the necessary skills to be successful productive employees.

Faced with problems of recruitment, retention and productivity we embarked on training programs designed to help overcome the problem areas.

After conducting a series of behavioral and task audits on entry level jobs, it was recognized that in addition to remedial education, in math and language skills, behavioral skills (world of work) training was required to assist the new hires to remain on the payroll and achieve upgrades.

The people administering and conducting the training were skilled trainers who could evaluate curriculum, make deletions and additions

based on individual needs, and recommend revisions. They were skilled in Company policy and benefits, knew corporate goals and objectives, understood the urban hire, and had the ability to counsel when the need arose.

Basis Jobs Program

Our Basic Job Program began in October of 1968. This eight week program was designed to employ and train disadvantaged urban residents who were unable to pass our Bell System Qualification Test entrance requirements. The company provided basic education in math and language skills along with behavioral skills training and world of work orientation so that the new employee could successfully perform in our work environment, readily absorb technical training and enhance his/her upgrade potential.

Hispanic trainees received an additional four week language component designed to help improve their speaking, listening and writing skills in the English language.

Individual and group counseling was included in the program to help trainees build a solid foundation for coping with and solving both personal and job-related problems.

A total of 589 employees have gone through this program over a six year period.

Traffic Operator Skills Program

This seven week program was introduced in August 1969 because of the high number of public complaints. The program was designed to

improve the technical and behavioral skills of Directory Assistance operators in the New York metropolitan area. In addition to the technical training (ten days), remedial job-related subjects such as geography, vocabulary, reading, communications and effective listening (ten days) and world of work orientation (fifteen days) were interwoven throughout the program, the schedule being adjustable to individual and class training needs.

This program included a sampling of marginally qualified trainees who developed to be proficient operators, thus making jobs available to applicants who encountered difficulties in passing employment entrance tests.

Counseling was provided throughout the program to help trainees solve any personal or job related problems and when necessary assistance was given in seeking professional guidance. One hundred ninety-five operators went through this program during the years 1969-1972.

For the past four years we have had little or no hiring. Due to mechanization of many of our telephone functions large surplus labor pools were created. As a result most of our educational and training efforts have been directed towards upgrading and retraining existing employees.

Clerical Typing Program

In this twelve week program typing and related clerical skills are taught to employees who are in positions where this skill is required or who are qualified for clerical jobs and are ready for transfer or promotion but lack typing skills.

Remedial Upgrade Program

To further assist departmental efforts to reduce the surplus work force by retraining employees for other positions requiring higher skills, this eight week program provides additional work in basic education (math and language skills). The program's objective is to raise scholastic achievement levels sufficiently so as to better prepare employees to pass the upgrade test. The program also includes a component designed to facilitate the transition from one work climate to another. To date 78 employees have gone through this program.

In-House English As A Second Language Program

This fifteen week multi-lingual language class is conducted twice weekly during working hours, two hours per session, for employees whose first language is other than English and who require additional work on language skills to increase their effectiveness on the job and open the way to other career opportunities. To date, 41 employees representing the Spanish, French, Chinese, Philippine, Italian, Russian, and Hindu languages have enrolled in this program.

Career and Skills Assistance Program

The purpose of this trial program is to encourage self development by providing financial assistance and counselling to regular full-time non-management employees who desire to undertake vocational training or developmental studies on a voluntary basis on their off-duty hours. The Company pays 75% of the tuition cost at registration for approved studies, the employee pays 25%.

The three components of this program are:

1. Career Consultation - Career consultants are available to assist employees develop their fullest potential by identifying and approving courses which contribute to the vocational or developmental objectives of the employee.
2. Developmental Studies - Courses of training in math and language skills which will assist in raising the employee's grade level and enhance their potential to qualify on Bell System tests.
3. Catalogue Courses - College courses related to an employee's present occupation or which would assist the employee to qualify for higher paying jobs.

Twenty-one colleges state-wide are participating in the program. Since the program's inception, 1744 employees have been advised by career consultants, 1214 have enrolled in developmental studies and 907 have enrolled in job-related catalog courses.

LEARNING WHILE THEY WORK: EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN CORPORATIONS

James L. D'Acosta
Program Manager and Affirmative Action Recruiter
General Electric Company

I appreciate the opportunity to represent an industrialist's view of educational opportunities in the world of work. Within the few minutes available, I will only attempt to outline a few illustrations from my own company, General Electric, which are probably representative of programs in other industries. These can serve as the basis for you to ask some questions about your primary interests and concerns in this area.

At the beginning I want to state the obvious: Our Company is a business enterprise and not an educational institution. Its primary objectives are related to the work; the educational aspects are important, but secondary. Since the work of a corporation is accomplished through its employees, the Company has an interest in their capacity to perform and to learn new things that can help them grow and progress in their work.

The development of educational opportunities in industry depends on the availability of jobs. In a tight economy, industry tends to trim its work force to those who can best contribute to the profitability and other objectives of the business.

Because our products have a high technological base, we are primarily involved in supplementing the technical education tied in with the working skills of our employees. The examples I am going to cite illustrate different

levels of education and different types of ties between the Company and formal educational institutions.

Summer Hires

About 1,000 to 1,500 college students Summer Hires per year.

Of these 20% are Engineering Students

27% are Minority

34% are Women

We probably eventually hire 60% of all Summer Hires.

Co-op Programs

About 400 students on Co-op.

80 are high school students not oriented to professional careers.

Of the 320 college students, 38% are Minority and

21% are Women

Have Co-op arrangements with 50/55 colleges.

75% of all college co-ops are engineering students.

We probably eventually hire 80% of all our Co-op Students.

Apprentice Program

Started in early 1900's.

Has about 1,000 participants at 23 locations and produces 250/300 graduates per year.

Basically a 3 to 4 year program of practical experience and skill training for machinists and tool and die makers.

Includes 700 hours of related studies over 4 years in Drafting, Shop Math, Blueprint Reading, Principles of Machining, etc.

Also includes college level programs leading to associate degree from a local college.

College Courses: Physics, Calculus, Thermodynamics, etc.

National Scale: About 270,000 apprentices in 1975 in all trades.

Advanced Course in Engineering

Conducted at 8 locations (including Utica/Syracuse and Schenectady/Pittsfield)

Leads to an MS Degree in Engineering from 7 tied-in universities, including RPI and Syracuse.

Course leaders include college faculty as well as experienced GE engineers with academic credentials.

Three-Year program involving 448 classroom hours, of which 262 are taught in-house and 186 at participating college.

Has produced 1,500 graduates in its 52-year history.

Financial Management Program Courses

5 Main Topics: Principles, Financial Accounting, Auditing, Management Accounting (includes Financial Analysis and Cost Accounting), Information Systems.

Each course runs for 11 to 15 classroom sessions of 2 hours each plus 4 to 6 hours of self-study and preparation.

Use quizzes and examination.

Conducted at 18 U.S. locations with 400 participants and many locations in Canada and overseas.

Course leaders are experienced finance managers who are FMP graduates.

Content also includes material of other functions: Marketing, Legal, Manaufacturing, Engineering and Employee Relations.

Manufacturing Studies

Offered to MMP's (10%) and Non-MMP's

15 course offerings over two to three year span.

300 classroom hours, plus self-studies.

Topics: Manufacturing, Finance, Marketing, Engineering, Human Relations, Quality Control, etc.

Oriented to basic principles and problem solving, using real business and technical situations.

Over 24 years, 19,000 people have taken manufacturing studies courses and 13,000 are graduates who completed the series.

Conclusions

General Electric is not an educational institution.

Development of educational opportunities depends on the availability of jobs.

It is a business with a high technology base.

GE is interested in the continual development and growth of its employees; education is one of several ways that contributed (others: diverse work assignments, geographic relocation; on-the-job experience and experimentation).

In all its educational endeavors, a principal thrust is application

and use of new knowledge acquired from study and experience. Becoming educationally qualified is not enough, getting a job is a competitive event in which an employer has available several qualified candidates to fill most job openings. Each candidate competes against others that are seeking the job at that time. One very important role I think you in education can and must accomplish is the development of positive attitudes in students that will stimulate them to become self sufficient and beyond that: to becoming contributing members of society.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE WORLD OF WORK

Catherine Farrell
Division of Cooperative Education
LaGuardia Community College, CUNY

In addressing myself to the challenge of identifying and structuring educational opportunities for students in the world of work, I first feel it necessary to place my remarks in the context of LaGuardia's goals and purposes and those of our students. The two are not always the same!

LaGuardia opened its doors just five years ago with a strong commitment to offer higher education opportunities to people in the surrounding communities of Queens whose life experience had seldom included college, and to offer this opportunity in the context of a comprehensive cooperative education program for all of our students. We have seen our student body become more diversified in the last few years, with a growing number of students coming from all of New York's five boroughs, representing many segments of the population. As our student body has become more diversified in age and life experience, the College has had to make programs more flexible to meet their needs. Yet we find that our goals have not really changed: we are still seeking to offer students an opportunity for greater awareness of the world around them and themselves in this increasingly complex world, and we strive to offer them the structure both in the classroom and out in the field that will provide a uniquely enriched learning experience.

Our students have their own reasons for coming to LaGuardia. The cooperative education program has sometimes been seen as a financial aid

package that will help a student through school, so many students come with the hope that the internships will support them through college. This is clearly inaccurate, although most of our internships are paid, and we now strive to make the distinction between the educational goals and the frequent financial rewards of the program. Students also come because they know they need experience in the "real world," and participation in an internship program which offers positions in a field of future career interest is surely one way to get it. This is particularly true of business and technical students, who may well stay with their internship employers after graduation. For the liberal arts students who will probably transfer to a four year college, the internships may provide an equally critical opportunity to weigh interests and abilities in a process that will shape the academic and career decisions of the coming years. And so in the end, the College and student objective for the program do go hand in hand.

What happens to the student, once he is out in the world of work? Do all the things we are seeking really occur? Is the business world really an appropriate setting for the educational process, or are the profit-making interests of corporations incompatible with the educational interests of the student? As the first speaker just reminded us, the first interest of industry is to make money, and only after that job is accomplished can these other concerns come into focus. What does this mean for the student who is out there for his own educational purposes?

Well, it usually means a variety of things. In some cases, the student is completely overwhelmed by the corporate world...and of course it does depend on the particular environment of the work place. Those few students who have never even ventured into Manhattan before may be bombarded by so many new and threatening stimuli that it will take a while to recover. Furthermore, when and if these problems do occur, the supervisor on the job may just be too busy or preoccupied to notice, much less to offer the support and assistance that could be helpful.

On the other hand, most of our students are highly motivated to "fit in," whatever the context, and so they are alert to the signals and demands of the new environment from the start. With this energy and drive, they very frequently make outstanding employees and lead our employers to feel that the program can very well suit their own purposes. At the same time, we as educators must encourage students to develop basic tools of questioning and analysis as they learn the ropes of the work situation and this may sometimes involve questioning the goals and the purposes of the organization for which they are working.

A third situation that often occurs is the one in which the student who is an under-achiever in the classroom becomes a star in the work setting. This may be the student whose basic skills are weak, but whose personality, spirit and innate ability help him to shine on the job. Many of these students are the backbone of the program, set an example to the employer and frequently end up working as permanent employees upon graduation.

Oftentimes, these students come to the job with the sensitivity that enables them to learn; but it is the success which they achieve on the job that can give them the confidence to go back to the classroom and become achievers there as well.

If we acknowledge that there are a variety of ways in which students may have "successful" experiences in the work setting, as I have tried to illustrate above, how can we be sure that the quality of their educational experience is what we have hoped for? At LaGuardia, we are presently struggling with this question, and we think it's an essential one. In the first few years of our program we worked hard to find the placements, knowing that we didn't have a program without them, and feeling that was success enough for the moment. We recognized that we were counting on some vague process of osmosis to take place and to guaranteee the learning experience. We now realize that we must do much more at the College and with our employers if we are going to offer the special mix of theory and practice that we strive for.

In brief, we are now working to engage the student in a long-range process of planning and structuring his internship experiences before they occur by setting educational objectives for himself that can then be assessed with the employer and the cooperative education advisor. The process which we have set up begins early in the freshman year at LaGuardia and continues on throughout the student's college program, with frequent opportunities for periodic assessment, and the altering objectives. The process goes as follows: 1) a non-credit course called "Co-op Prep" which clarifies the

purposes of the internship program, and involves students early in the process of setting educational and career objectives; 2) continuous one-on-one communication between student and advisor for the purpose of internship, designed to provide an opportunity for sharing experiences and concerns as well as developing skills in analysis and goal-setting; 4) and finally, a massive program undertaken in the last two years that involves teaching and cooperative education faculty in a reworking of curriculum and internships so that the two may benefit and support each other, thus increasing the reinforcement of students' learning.

The above process which I have outlined so very briefly will hopefully give you a sense of the commitment we at LaGuardia now feel to develop an instiution that draws on the best of traditional classroom practices and the most disciplined of experiential educational techniques to create a truly innovative opportunity for growth and development for our students. We are excited by this venture. We need and are seeking assistance from industry and from our colleagues in many disciplines because we sense that this must be a partnership. And last but not least of all, we must involve our students in this process of development and assessment. As they become more responsible for their own learning they catch the excitement inherent in such a process, and the partnership expands. Won't you join us?

Workshop on: "Developing Access to Graduate and Professional School"

Moderator: Stephen Adolphus
Chief, Higher Education Opportunities Program
State Education Department
Albany, New York

Panelists: Dean K. Harrison
Coordinator, Office of Expanded Educational Opportunity
Graduate School and University Center, CUNY
New York, New York

Lonnie Morrison
Director, EOP
New Jersey Institute of Technology
New Jersey

Carl Bello
Health Manpower Program Specialist
HEW Regional Office
New York, New York

The import of this presentation was to discuss the low percentage of minorities in graduate and professional schools. Despite Federal and State programs to increase this activity, the number of minorities advancing to these levels of education is disappointingly small.

The United States Public Health Service has sponsored programs to increase the number of students entering Health Professions schools. The recently enacted Public Law 94-484 continues the authority to support such programs.

The major program effort is in the outreach and recruitment of minority students for Health Professions enrollment. These programs are under the jurisdiction of Public Health Service Special Projects.

Some existing programs in New York State are as follows:

Institution	Program Director
Upstate Medical Center Syracuse, N.Y.	Mr. Foster Burnett (201) 456-5431
New York Medical College New York, N.Y.	Dr. Anthony A. Clemendor (212) 860-7156
Mt. Sinai School of Medicine New York, N.Y.	Dr. Edward Ronan (212) 650-7057
SUNY College of Optometry New York, N.Y.	Dr. Alden N. Haffner (212) 677-1300
SUNY at Buffalo, School of Medicine, Buffalo, N.Y.	Dr. Leonard Katz (716) 831-4241

It was the intent of this presentation to inform Special Program staff of the effort being made by the Federal Government to increase minority enrollment at the professional level. Moreover, Special Program staff must encourage and motivate undergraduate students to pursue graduate levels of attainment. There are also Federal Student Assistance Programs available for Health Professions study.

INCREASING MINORITY REPRESENTATION IN ENGINEERING & RELATED PROFESSIONS

Lonnie Powers
Director, EOP
New Jersey Institute of Technology

There is currently an unprecedented national effort to encourage minority students to pursue careers in and thereby increase their numbers in engineering institutions and the engineering profession. Although there are numerous reasons for this current effort (Affirmative Action Programs, Minority and Women's Movement, and Government Regulations), I think a primary reason is related to the fact that industry foresees a need for additional engineers that cannot be adequately met by projected engineering enrollment figures.

The Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics periodically publishes a report called Occupational Manpower and Training Needs. In the revised 1974 edition, the Bureau projected that there will be a need for 73,500 engineers per year from 1972-1987 and that by 1985, there will be a need for a total of 1,500,000 engineers which is a 41.5% increase over the 1972 employment figures (73,500 represents 34,000 for growth and 39,500 for replacement). According to John Alden, the Executive Director of the Engineering Manpower Commission, since 1972 the number of students graduating with degrees in engineering has been declining. For the year ending June 30, 1975, a total of 57,121 engineering degrees were awarded, which is a decline of 3,533 graduates since 1974. However, in spite of the fact

that there has been a decline in the total number of engineering degrees awarded, there has been an increase in the number of engineering degrees awarded to blacks. For other minority groups, notably Puerto Ricans, Chicano-Mexican Americans, and Native Americans, accurate data is difficult to obtain; although from the data that is available, it is apparent that they too are poorly represented in engineering institutions and in the engineering profession.

Developing Access to Graduate School

Developing access to engineering institutions for minority and educationally disadvantaged students is somewhat more difficult than developing access to undergraduate schools. However, it is important that access to graduate schools be developed and maintained since graduate education, especially in engineering, provides a major avenue for entrance into leadership and professional positions in this society.

At our institution, New Jersey Institute of Technology, we have attempted to increase our minority graduate enrollment and in the process have experienced some difficulties. We have found that many of our minority undergraduates do not go directly on to graduate school because of family/personal problems, financial obligations, fear of failure in graduate school, labor market uncertainties, because of the time needed to complete an engineering graduate education, etc.. However, one of the most important reasons is that salaries offered to engineering undergraduates, specifically to minority engineering

undergraduates, by companies are difficult to refuse. In addition, the fact that we have no dormitory facilities make it difficult if not impossible to compete at the graduate level with other engineering institutions that have residential facilities.

We have attempted to deal with our particular problems by developing activities that are directed toward both our short-range and long-range goals and objectives. We recognize that there are some barriers we cannot adequately deal with, such as family/personal problems. Furthermore, although we are unable to compete with the salaries provided by industry, we do attempt to make our graduate financial aid package as attractive as possible. We try to provide every minority graduate student with a graduate fellowship or scholarship, an Educational Opportunity Fund Graduate Grant, part-time employment, and additional supplemental aid with contributions from outside sources. As a result, we have been somewhat successful in our effort to recruit minority students into our graduate school.

Minority graduate enrollment in engineering institutions will not increase significantly until the pool of minority undergraduates is increased. This is currently where a large part of our effort is being directed. We have developed a number of programs at our Institute with local high schools and with industry which are designed to motivate and academically prepare minority and educationally disadvantaged students to pursue engineering and other technically oriented degree programs.

High School Urban Engineering Program: The High School Urban Engineering Program is a six-week summer program for eleventh and twelth grade students. The program is designed to reinforce participants' high school academic program as well as to expose them to the various fields in engineering and other technical professions.

High School College Bound Program: The High School College Bound Program is a three-year high school program designed to identify academically talented minority students who are interested in pursuing a career in engineering. An integral part of the program is the tutorial assistance provided by some of the minority undergraduate students.

Educational Opportunity Program: The Educational Opportunity Program is designed to provide an opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students to pursue an engineering or technical degree program. The program provides tutorial, counseling, and financial assistance.

Industrial Minority Engineering Opportunity Programs: The Industrial Minority Engineering Opportunity Program is a program coordinated with industry to provide summer engineering employment opportunities for minority and educationally disadvantaged students.

What we are doing at New Jersey Institute of Technology is not unique to our institution. There are other engineering institutions that are doing very similar things although some more successful than others. I am convinced that developing access to engineering graduate schools in the long run will not depend on our short-range efforts but on how effective we are in achieveing our long-range goals and objectives.

Workshop on: "Improving Career Counseling with Better Information"

Moderator: Roy I. Satre, Jr.
Dean of the Institute College
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rochester, New York

Panelists: R. Thomas Flynn
Vice President for Student Affairs
Monroe Community College
Rochester, New York

Cynthia McGill
Program Coordinator of Special Services
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rochester, New York

Post-presentation discussions centered on several topics, among them the legality of keeping records and collecting information. Information is often requested in such abundance that institutions cannot possibly take on the responsibility of collecting and interpreting it. Much required information is difficult to obtain, especially after the student leaves the campus.

It was pointed out that information about jobs, etc. is only one aspect of counseling re career selection. Self-evaluation, what type of people are preferred in the work environment, and other factors will (should) influence the choice of careers.

The statement was made that the student usually has tried something else (a personal approach?) before turning to a career counselor.

Considerable discussion centered on the ethic of consumerism. While this a a laudatory approach, the question was asked, "What will you do

when enrollments fall?"

The danger in providing a too narrow educational program was discussed. One statement that drew some negative reaction was that the liberal arts graduate can go in any direction in the labor market.

A big question centered on the availability of career information. What state and national efforts are being made to identify current and future jobs? Part of the problem is that institutions must be aware of what is available.

There is a parallel between business and education. Business identifies a market for the product before producing it. Shouldn't the schools determine the market before the students are educated about any type of work? Is that not why so many fields are overcrowded?

A discussion of profit motive was briefly touched upon, using General Motor's latest quarterly release.

In summary, it was noted that three points stood out as demanding greater attention.

1. The whole matter of consumerism - a more honest reporting (advertising?) by the educational institutions.
2. There must be more business/education cooperation in answer to career selection problems.
3. There is a great need for more information about jobs and employment at the state and national level.

IMPROVING CAREER COUNSELING

Ray I. Satre, Jr.
Dean, Institute College
Rochester Institute of Technology

The topic of improving career counseling is moving toward greater importance in RIT as we plan and develop a proposed new graduate program titled "Career Information Specialist." My past interest in this area has been enhanced by serving on the New York Manpower Services Council and as chairman of the Genesee/Finger Lakes Ancillary Manpower Planning Board.

All of the panelists I will introduce have significant roles to play in their institutions, roles related to improvement of opportunities in higher education.

Let me set the stage by making some brief observations relative to the need for improvement of career counseling in all levels of our educational institutions. I will borrow a second- or third-hand illustration (I do not know the original source) that will indicate the plight of the educated person as he or she attempts to fulfill a life's ambition in a work world where positions at the upper level of employment (meaning good salaries and/or prestige positions) are too few to meet the expectations of those who have been educated and trained to fill them.

Things have changed during this century--from a relatively stable balance of numbers of high and middle management level jobs with numbers of educated people that could realistically fill them--to a situation where

open enrollment and tuition assistance have produced far too many qualified persons for the rather static number of jobs. Using just one example, as the public school enrollment falls, more teachers are entering that particular area of the labor market. This type of situation creates an ill in society that will be a long time in healing. How would you feel if you achieved a graduate degree in history and were forced to earn your livelihood driving a taxi, or a Bachelor of Science in Nursing and had to work as a practical nurse or orderly.

We are faced with these problems--problems of people who are educated for a field in which they may never find employment equal to their abilities--and likewise those who enter a chosen career for reasons that do not hold valid, only to become bored and confused with their role in the work force!

Can better career counseling help alleviate these unfortunate accidents of fate? There are many alternatives, but each is lacking in the realistic parameters of human nature, human needs, and human growth. Aside from stressing the dignity of every type of work and the worth of the individual no matter what position he or she holds, proper and exacting career counseling and career decision-making information seem to offer the best hopes of answering the many problems related to human achievement and waste of talent and resources as we identify them today.

Willard Wirtz, in his latest book, The Boundless Resource, offers a strategy for change that develops eleven proposals. Each proposal plays an intimate role in broadening career information to children and adults alike.

I view three of these proposals as absolute essentials if we are to improve the education/work relationships that will allow (a) a sampling of work, (b) a choice of career field, (c) an opportunity to be trained and educated in that field, and (d) eventual employment in a satisfying work role that enhances the individual's appreciation of self and his/her worth as a contributing member of society.

These three (out of eleven) proposals are:

> That it be provided, as a total community undertaking, that all high school and college students receive at least five hours per year of career guidance and counseling from both professionally trained and work-or-service-experienced counselors.
>
> That a more effective capacity for integrating education and work policy be developed at the national and state levels.
>
> That a complete inventory be made of the extent and effect of laws, practices, and customs that constrain or otherwise influence people's movement between education and work.

Much has to be accomplished before we can move successfully toward a goal of comprehensive career achievement. The stage has to be set for any successful counseling situation in our colleges. This can be accomplished only through honest and better career and institutional information dissemination.

Our panelists this morning are each active in this process of bettering information about institutions and careers that is imparted to students and their parents.

BETTER INFORMATION FOR STUDENT CHOICE

Thomas Flynn
Vice President for Student Affairs
Monroe Community College

While there are people far more qualified than I to speak on many phases of improving career counseling, I believe my experience during the past 18 months with National Project I: Better Information for Student Choice to be of significanct importance.

First, let me briefly explain the goals and objectives of National Project I: in December, 1974, the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, sponsored by H.E.W., invited post-secondary educational institutions and agencies to become part of a National Project to work on the general problem of developing more helpful information about post-secondary education institutions for prospective students. Although considerable information exists for prospective students about the post-secondary education enterprise, improvements could be made in the organization of that information in order that comparative judgments might be made, enhancing both the match between students and the post-secondary institution and their selection process.

Many institutions and agencies have been working on this general problem for some time. Several accepted the Fund's invitation to either serve as a demonstration institution or a resource agency. The Fund selected 11 institutions to serve as demonstration institutions. These are: Heald Business Colleges in California, National Radio Institute in Washington, D.C., Mountain Empire Community College in Virginia, Monroe Community College in New York,

University of California at Irvine, Portland State University in Oregon, the University of Illinois at Urbana, Barat College in Illinois, Morris Brown College in Georgia, University of California at Los Angeles and Macomb County Community College in Michigan.

As you will note, these 11 institutions are broad representatives of the several sectors of post-secondary education, including the public, private and proprietary institutions and also ranging from multi-purpose comprehensive universities to the single mission oriented schools.

While each of the institutions has a specific project which it is working toward and will complete by December 1 of this year, collectively the institutions are working on a National Project to provide guidance to institutions regarding the information they release to prospective students. The National Project will include a final report which will be widely distributed within the United States. Also, in the Spring of next year, a National Invitational Conference will be sponsered by the National Task Force for top educational administrators throughout the United States.

The overall purpose of this effort which started in December of 1974 has been to provide better information for student choice. Basically, institutions are encouraged to provide information which should answer the one question which every prospective student should ask of an institution--that being, "What will happen to me if I attend your institution?"

While the National Project is geared directly to the student consumerism issue, there is no question that it has important relevance to career counseling. Everyone who has ever sat with a student in a counseling situation knows the

value of a positive atmosphere. If the student has been misled by improper or unclear information, he presents the counselor with a negative attitude toward the college. The counselor is then faced with a counseling session which will begin on a negative note as the student describes his frustration regarding his expectations not being met. In essence, it will take the counselor a great deal more time to assist the student, thus a more costly process to the institution.

Thus, recognizing that better information can enhance career counseling, it is important for all of us to understand more about the development and the delivery of information to prospective students. Basically, I will be referring to what I call full disclosure to prospective students.

What do we mean by full disclosure?

There are many cliches or coined phrases regarding student consumerism. Almost every conference held in the United States during the past 12 months has had a program regarding consumerism programs. It is the "in thing" in higher education. But what is it we are really promoting? After working with the National Task Force for more than one year, it is clear to me that what we are saying is the following: We want better information for student choice--not more information but better information.

This better information for prospective students is information that facilitates their choice-making. Questions such as: (1) Should I participate in post-secondary education? (2) If so, which institution should I enter and (3) What programs of study should I pursue?

This better information must contain the following characteristics:

(1) it must be valued; (2) it must be applicable; (3) it must be practicable; (4) it must be understandable; (5) it must be accurate; and (6) it must be timely.

Now an obvious question: "What specific type of information are we talking about? I refer you to the earlier point--the information necessary to facilitate the selection process.

The next question is how does an institution obtain that type of information? The 11 institutions in the National Project have concluded that the only way to gather this type of information is to conduct a needs assessment study involving prospective students, current students, high school guidance counselors, alumni, parents and others who may have a role to play. At Monroe Community College, we have spent nearly one year doing just that. Some of you in this room have participated in our study.

Let me give you one example where better information is needed in facilitating the selection process in a career field.

I have often related the story of my own daughter who is now six years old. She wants to be a nurse and when I had questioned her as to why, it is because she has watched Dr. Welby's nurse, Consuela, and Dixie on the Emergency Program on TV. Who wouldn't like a job like that? She sees the very glorified part of being a nurse.

I wonder who is going to tell her what being a nurse is really like. I wonder if our high school graduates today are being informed of the following information about a nursing program. Are they aware that their chances of

being admitted to an R.N. program are about 1 in 5 in the State of New York? Are they aware that only 50% of all students who enroll in nursing programs complete the program? And are they aware that when they graduate with that R.N. diploma, that first job is not going to parallel what they see on TV? They most likely will start work on the third shift in a hospital; they must be available to work seven days a week with most likely no summer vacation for the first two years. If a student has this factual information before making the decision to enter the program, we can be assured that the chance of dissatisfaction and frustration is less likely.

That is just one example. You can draw analogies for almost every career field imaginable.

There are other reasons that we should promote full disclosure within institutions. I have broken the reasons down into three areas. First, we have a moral reason. I have mentioned some of the reasons but basically this is a very difficult time for one to select a profession. Due to the economic conditions within our country, our students need the best information possible as they train for their career. Obtaining jobs today is more difficult than it was 10-15 years ago.

Next are the legal reasons for providing better information. From a pure liability standpoint, institutions had better be sure their information is accurate. In July of 1976, there were more than 60 cases in the courts brought by students against institutions for misrepresentaion of information. Following are some of the examples of those cases.

1. A student brought suit against a four-year university because the catalog course description differed from the course content as delivered.
2. Nursing students in a community college filed suit because they were not permitted to advance to the second year level because they had received a "D" grade in their first-year nursing course. Their suit contended that nowhere in the advance information were they informed that nursing students had to maintain a "C" average to advance. In fact, they noted that the college catalog stated that passing grades were "A", "B", "C" and "D".
3. At a four-year university, students brought suit against the institution because the catalog in their freshman year noted to them they could be assured that within the period of their study, tuition would not be raised more than $200 a year. Tuition was raised more than that, thus the reason for the suit.
4. And finally one which interests me from a humourous standpoint but at the same time shows the necessity for institutions to be more accurate in the information they release. A student at Columbia University sued the institution because the university failed to "imbue him with wisdom, truth, character, enlightenment, understanding, justice, liberty, honesty, courage, beauty and similar virtues and qualities promised in university documents, presidential pronouncements and inscriptions on certain buildings." (I am not sure which one of these particular items he was not imbued with.)

But there may even be a more important reason why institutions must have better

disclosure of information. That is the forthcoming federal controls if post-secondary institutions do not get their house in order regarding information presented to the public.

Because colleges and universities have not acted promptly and responsibly in the past, we have had such intervention in federal student aid programs and other decisions regarding the funding of academic programs.

Another example of federal intervention is that the U.S. Office of Education plans to impose a uniform national policy on tuition refunds. Why is it that we see more and more intervention of the federal government in our educational system, especially when federal support of education is not keeping pace with educational needs? I believe Samuel Halpern, Director of the Institute for Edcuational Leadership at George Washington University, who was the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation at the Department of Health, Education & Welfare from 1966-69, has best stated this case. In a recent issue of an article to the Education Commission of the States, he notes the following and I quote:

> To be sure, federal legislation is increasingly preemptive, prescriptive and regulatory. Indeed the weight of federal guidelines and regulations may soon outweigh the beneficial impact of relatively meager federal fiscal support. A maze of federal programs is hard to understand--let alone administer--particularly as Congress frequently rewrites basic law.
>
> Yet the basic problem is not, as a growing number of educators assert, that Congress seeks to take over the nation's schools...
>
> Why then the increasing federal inroads on state policy-making? Because the federal system is seriously out of balance. In Congress' perception, state authorities and educators alike are defaulting on difficult problems. Name any major social issue of our time-- the

> war on poverty, access to equal educational opportunity, sexual and racial equality, equalization of educational financing, privacy and the rights of individuals. Washington's typical response is to solve the problem with federal incentives, well-intentioned but sometimes ill-conceived.

Therefore, as Dr. Halpern states, Congress acts when it views the need of the public not being met. I contend that due to institutions not providing full disclosure, the stage is being set for federal intervention within the higher education community. The number of student consumerism complaints and the cases in the courts alone are enough to provide the impetus for such federal controls.

I hope that my inferences toward career counseling as I discuss the Better Information project are clear. However, in case they are not, let me make a few qualifying statements.

I am sure that most of us will agree that career counseling does not necessarily begin when one sits down with a career counselor. Many individuals--and I believe most--search for career counseling through others after they become frustrated or are just not generally satisfied with a current situation. Our research has shown that many of the frustrations which individuals have are based upon unfilled expectations due to inaccurate information.

It is my contention that one begins his or her career counseling when they begin to search out information to either confirm or change their current lifestyle. Therefore, it is ultimately important that all of us take care in assuring that information which we release from institutions be complete and accurate. We should keep in mind that our information should answer the question: "What will happen to me if I come to your institution?"

Workshop on: "Conducting Evaluative Research"

Moderator:
Lewis Hoffman
Research Director, Office of Special Programs
City University of New York

Panelists:
Allen J. Simon
Consultant to the Research Foundation
City University of New York

David Sylves
JnD Research
Williamsville, New York

Judith G. Wolf
JnD Research
Williamsville, New York

POST COLLEGE EXPERIENCE OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS: A FOLLOW-UP OF HEOP GRADUATES AND DROPOUTS

Judith G. Wolf
JnD Research
Williamsville, New York

Statement:

In a desire to accumulate accountability data for the evaluation of its own program, a study was commissioned by the Higher Education Opportunity Program of the New York State Education Department and was conducted by JnD Research in cooperation with Daemen College (Rosary Hill), Canisius College, and Niagara University. The abstract of this study is presented below.

During the 1975-76 academic year, a study was conducted for the purposes of documenting the career related post-college experiences of HEOP students who had attended three colleges in western New York. Of several methods used to collect relevant data, the telephone interview was found to be the most effective. Ultimately, 42 of a possible 52 graduates and 76 of a possible 163 dropouts responded to a survey designed to elicit information pertaining to post-college experiences, perceptions of the college experience, and perceived influence of the college experience on the post-college experience. Analysis provided the following findings.

GRADUATES Three-quarters of the graduates are employed. The majority of these work in white collar jobs which can be classified as relatively high career status level. More than a third have earned at least $9,000 in a

given year since graduating.

Education appears to interest this sample of graduates. Forty percent of them have continued to take courses in a variety of settings. Advanced degree programs have attracted approximately a third of the group.

The perceptions of this group toward their college experience and its influence on the post-college experience are positive. They feel that they derived many personal and professional benefits from attending college.

DROPOUTS - Seventy-two percent of the dropouts are presently employed. While most their jobs can be considered white collar, approximately one-quarter of these are generally regarded as high career status level. Additionally, 18% of the group reported earned yearly incomes over $9,000.

Although the majority of the dropouts left college before the end of their second year, approximately half have resumed student status. Close to one-third of the remaining persons indicated plans to do so.

Their actions disclose the value they place on education. It is, therefore not surprising that their attitude toward their college experience is relatively positive.

Many of the dropout group felt that their college experience did not influence employment status. A vast majority, however, stated that they are "better off" having attended and are glad they had the opportunity.

KEYNOTE AND GUEST SPEAKERS

BEYOND EMERGENT STATUS

James F. Kelly
Acting Chancellor
State University of New York

I'm very grateful for the opportunity to participate in this second conference on Higher Education Opportunity Programs. Your conference theme, Beyond Emerging Needs, very appropriately describes the opportunity program situation as I see it today and as I picture it in the near future.

First, and most importantly, the special programs in the three sectors of higher education across the State of New York have made it possible for thousands of adults and young people who had been previously by-passed by our institutions of higher education to obtain access to college and to make significant educational progress. Since the beginning, ten years ago, which saw approximately twelve hundred students being served in the three sectors, significant developments have occurred and the programs indeed are well beyond an emerging status. The opportunity programs in 1975-76 served a total of thirty-two thousand seven hundred students through EOP, SEEK, College Discovery, and HEOP. The educational opportunity centers, formerly called urban centers or cooperative college centers, have served thousands of additional students in a pre-college but postsecondary mode. The fact that the programs are beyond an emerging status is also evident

in the investment made by the State of New York as reported in figures supplied by the Education Department: the annual appropriation in 1966-67 was 1.5 million dollars; in 1975-76, the same composite programs were supported by the State of New York at the level of 34 million dollars.

This same decade of growth reflects significant progress in improving and coordinating the opportunity programs: a basic general plan is followed by all, common eligibility criteria tend to be used, economic aid packages are shaped along common lines, and the annual final reports follow the same pattern. This has not occurred by accident, of course: the records show extensive negotiation not only among the leadership of the three sectors and the four different programs but also involving the Legislature, the Division of the Budget, and the administering campuses. It is also evident that much of the improvement in program coordination can be credited to the work of the Statewide Committee on Educational Opportunity which is sponsoring this conference.

As important as these observations about finance and coordination surely are, it is even more important to make note of the fact that opportunity program personnel, both instructional (with which I include the counseling staff that instructs students so well in the important area of coping skills) and the administrative staff, are taking the initiative to improve their own effectiveness. I have noted with interest that ideas about instruction and counseling are being shared in regional workshops and other annual meetings like this one. In the State University of New York, for example, the Faculty Senate Committee on Expanding Educational Opportunity

has sponsored annual institutes on innovative teaching and counseling which feature discussion of such topics as counseling the first-year student, improving reading instruction, orienting the student to challenges of campus life, designing tutorial programs to meet academic deficiencies, and making testing more relevant. Improvement in the education of academically handicapped students also has been the focus of regional meetings such as the 1975 Conference on Educational Opportunity Center Programs sponsored by the State University of New York, the State Education Department, and Hudson Valley Community College. Intense discussion centered around curriculum development, planning and budgeting, and student services, to name only a few of the topics.

As the programs move beyond an emerging status, therefore, they show strength that will stand them in good stead for the challenging years ahead, although continued progress faces some deterrent due to a changing educational and social context. I am confident that chances are very good that many current and emerging difficulties can be overcome. We would be remiss, however, if we did not note with due care the changing educational and social context.

There are abundant signs of increasing doubt in the public at large and among elected officials about the effectiveness of programs, of all kinds in relation to the funds invested. I'm sure that you've heard others speak about cost/effectiveness review and about result-oriented data, but let me present a few examples to underscore this point. Newspapers

report inquiries about the effectiveness as well as the responsiveness of public programs; these become the subject of political discussion that frequently takes a negative tone. Referendums in several states showed an inclination to make new state and local projects entailing tax increases subject to popular vote. Many of these proposals were defeated, giving evidence of increased resistance among taxpayers to the cost increases of even the most beneficial of the public programs.

What should be our stance in the view of this mounting resistance? As we look at the competition between the demand for services on one hand and the depleted fiscal resources on the other, we must develop the best possible program management and, perhaps, even tighten our financial assistance belts. I'm troubled deeply when audits of programs in all three sectors reveal serious management deficiencies. And I'm troubled still more when I hear key spokesmen, federal and state, expressing uncertainty about the escalator effect of financial aid commitments authorized by law. On the federal scene, strong concern is being voiced about the rising cost of the BEOG program, in spite of the obvious need to help more citizens obtain postsecondary education. On the state scene, concern about the rising cost of the Tuition Assistance Program accounts, in part, for legislative efforts to tighten the controls on awards so that only those who need assistance receive it. I understand that Mrs. Dickinson, President of the Higher Education Services Corporation, which administers TAP, will appear at your conference. I urge you to hear her, and to raise questions with her.

Since I serve on the Board of the Corporation I know that Mrs. Dickinson feels concern about the possibility that very needy students may be among those most harmed by the efforts to tighten those controls. I urge you to describe some of the situations that you know and make some of the suggestions that I'm sure you have to improve the need analysis, particularly to separate the bona fide emancipated students from those who claim that status but may not be justified in having it.

For the first time in my memory, questions about the payoff of higher education are being voiced loudly and in a very critical tone by students and parents as well as the public officials who vote the funds to aid both public and private higher education. Rightly or wrongly, they ask, "Does education really lead to better employment?" As much as we would like to insist that education has benefits far above and beyond making a person employable, we have sold the concept that higher education brings a better life, and people automatically translate that into better income and higher status jobs. In a sense, therefore, we have contributed to our own problem by our sales pitch. We see an increasing number of students turning to the occupational programs, the associate degree and the applied science degree, that they believe will lead to attainment of employable skills. We also may be seeing a generation that doesn't want to explore deeply those problems of the human condition that were examined so exhaustively in the 60's; perhaps this generation of students prefers to avoid the difficult grappling with problems such as world population and food distribution that appear so irresolvable.

This close examination of the public mood doesn't make me feel despondent about a shift in public opinion. The public has the obligation to question programs, projects, and institutions that represent an investment of time, energy, and funds to the extent required by our higher education programs. I am not discouraged by the criticism, because I believe there are ways of overcoming the difficulties that have been cited--sometimes in an exaggerated fashion--and of showing that higher education can put its house in order.

For example, management deficiencies such as poor record-keeping certainly can be overcome, and I commend the inservice training plans that you who are program administrators are now adopting. Educational institutions are slowly being sensitized to the need for accountability in all programs and are searching for better ways to measure results. You might find examples to help you in some of the regional interinstitutional cooperation endeavors, involving public and private colleges. We surely can do a better job of assuring that minority students are channeled increasingly into those fields in which they are underrepresented: the sciences, engineering, accounting, computer sciences, the health professions, and urban and regional planning. This is not only necessary because our economy needs committed people to serve in these career fields but also because the minority students who represent the largest proportion of the educationally disadvantaged in our educational opportunity programs have abilities that have gone unrecognized for too long, abilities equal to the challenges of these so-called difficult fields.

Your work has enabled us to gather more evidence of the success that students in the opportunity programs can attain. This is evident in grade-point averages, academic honors, employment gained, and increasing entry into graduate and professional study. But recent reports raise some doubts about the continuation of that flow into graduate and professional study. The numbers of minority students applying has decreased somewhat, it appears, and the special funding that was supporting graduate and professional study by minority students is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain. While this is deplorable, you who are teachers should regard it as a challenge to make sure that the educational experience provided in your two-year and four-year programs is as strong as possible. You who are counselors should work harder to identify those students with the staying power and the academic ability to meet the challenges of graduate and professional study.

We are learning from the very experiences that you are making possible that changes in testing, course methods and materials, and personal counseling, will pay dividends for <u>all</u> students. Why we needed opportunity programs to encourage us to take a look at how we were educating youth and adults, I'm not sure. Perhaps we grew complacent in the past decade and you, by your success with students who did not meet the usual admission criteria, have shown us that the correlation between the usual predictors of college performance and the actual performance of students is not nearly as reliable as many educators had assumed.

The programs that you have planned for this conference encourage me to believe that you will leave the conference with new insights and new

information to help you meet the challenges that I've outlined in the past few minutes. Issues important to the future of opportunity programs await your discussion. Among these is the very sensitive question of institutionalizing opportunity programs, to which I urge you to give deep thought. Will the retention and advancement of competent opportunity programs staff be enhanced or diminished by institutionalization of EOP, HEOP, College Discovery, and the SEEK Program? Will departmental distribution of specialists who are now successful in work with opportunity program students decrease their effectiveness? Put another way, is it better to have separate departments specializing in the education of opportunity students or to have specialists distributed among academic departments? How can interoffice and interdepartmental cooperation be enhanced if the organizational arrangement for opportunity programs is kept separate? Put another way, Can we best preserve the priority of effective service to students by institutionalization or by separation? Other important issues will be discussed, I'm sure; I've highlighted this one because it has such importance for our long-range planning, for your morale, and most importantly, for the benefits of the students you serve.

As you go into the workshops where you will share ideas on such important matters as the financial aid problems of the emancipated opportunity student and the ways to increase student retention and achievement, I urge you to think deeply, to reason well with one another, and to maintain that spirit of cooperation that I sense among all of you in the opportunity programs of all three sectors. Perhaps your example of cooperation will serve as a model for others who must come to grips with other problems in those three sectors. I thank you for giving me this opportunity to meet you and share these thoughts with you.

THE BOTTOM LINE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

Stephen J. Wright
College Entrance Examination Board

The last line in any typical financial statement of any enterprise, corporation or institution is, by all odds, the most important-- however long and detailed that statement may be. The reason for the enormous importance of this line is that it tells us, at a glance, whether the operation is breaking even, making money or losing money, and if losing money, how much, and if making money, how much. This last line has come to be popularly known as the bottom line. And since just about every literate person understands what it means, the term has come to have several metaphorical meanings - two of which have relevance for what I have prepared to say:

1. It is used to indicate, in a shorthand way, whether a program or project or almost any human endeavor is or has been successful;
2. It is used also as an instant way to get at the irreducible essence of an idea or a proposal.

What I intend to do in the course of these remarks is to examine with you several aspects of the bottom line of Equal Opportunity Programs and I have chosen to put it this way in order to make as certain as possible that what I have to say does not get lost in rhetoric.

I. The bottom line of our experience with well-organized, well-administered

Equal Opportunity Programs to date tells us that they have been successful-- successful in the sense that they have made substantial progress toward redressing the enormous inbalance of minorities in higher education; successful in the sense that they have helped to rescue literally thousands of disadvantaged students from permanent poverty, with its plethora of crippling effects, and they have transformed those rescued into tax-paying, socially useful citizens who will perpetuate their kind.

You will note that my generalization concerning these programs carried an important qualification-- i.e., it included only those that are well-organized and administered. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to call attention to this qualification as a way of recognizing that we have had some bad programs as has just about everybody else in education. But the bottom line for the majority of these programs tells us that they have been successful. Not only this, but we know a great deal more than we did a decade ago about what makes for successful programs.

1. We know, as Mulka and Sheerin point out in their comprehensive study, that compensatory programs have been consistent in identifying a lack of basic academic skills and poor study habits as the most powerful limiting factors in equalizing educational opportunity for the disadvantaged and that competency in oral and written communication and that basic reading and mathematical skills cannot be left to chance.
2. We know that the motivation of students is a critical factor in the successful pursuit of a higher education and that it should play a particularly significant role in counselling disadvantaged students.

3. We know that matching students with institutions appropriate for their special needs and their aspirations is a critical factor in their success.
4. We know that accurate diagnosis, followed by proper placement and sensitive attention to what the diagnosis indicates, is critical to the success of disadvantaged students.
5. We know that without adequate financial aid, based upon assessed need, no program is going to have an impact of any real consequence.

All of this is to emphasize the fact that we have not demonstrated that good programs work but that we now know a great deal about how to organize and administer them --in short, what is needed to make them work!

II. If the Equal Opportunity Programs are as good as I have indicated they are, the critical question is: Why, then, are they in jeopardy? We find the answer to this question, in part, I think, in the contrast between the "Golden Era" in higher education, about 1950 to about 1968, when the nation's faith in and commitment to higher education was deep and strong, and what we have now --a shrinking faith and a greatly diminished commitment; we find the answer in part, I think, in the contrast between the period 1964-1972 when the nations's commitment to equality of opportunity was at its greatest strength, and what we have now-- a greatly diminished commitment and greatly unfinished agenda.

To put the situation another way, we are now in a period of sky-rocketing costs, of accountability, of a diminishing commitment to higher education,

rooted I believe, in a diminishing faith in what education can do. We no longer sincerely believe with the great Horace Mann that "education is the great equalizer of the conditions of men-- the balance wheel of the society." A few examples will illustrate the point: The great City University of New York -- one of the noblest endeavors of this century-- was closed for several weeks last year because the money ran out and about the only people who were genuinely outraged were the teachers and the students. The Supreme Court of New Jersey had to close the public schools to force the legislature to enact the tax legislation required to support an equitable system. State systems of higher education in a number of states-- including, again, New Jersey-- are placing limitations on enrollments without, I think, counting the cost to future generations. Any one of us could cite many other examples. Clark Kerr summarizes the situation when he says that "higher education has entered the new depression." And this being the case, there is a pervasive mentality in the land that is willing, if not eager, to apply surgery, if not the ax, to any program it sees as a "frill," i.e., any program that cannot meet the cost of short-sighted, cost-benefit "analysis," or programs that have no constituency that can "rock the boat." In the minds of far too many powerful people, Equal Opportunity Programs qualify for emasculation by all of these insidious criteria.

What is happening, as we look around the nation, appears to be what almost amounts to an anti-minority movement. Let me give a few examples: There appears to be a growing resistance to special admissions programs for minority students-- beginning with the DeFunis Case at the University of

Washington and more recently, the Bakke Case involving the Medical School at the University of California at Davis. In this latter case, the California Supreme Court issued an order which, in effect, prohibits the University of California as a system from operating special programs for the admission of minority students. The Office of Civil Rights, a few months ago, attempted to force the University of Maryland to comply with the ruling in the Adams vs. Richardson case -- a class action case brought by Adams and others to require some 10 states to obey the Civil Rights Law of 1964 which forbids discrimination based on race and sex. The penalty in such a case is the withdrawal of federal financial funds. Maryland has filed a counter suit in which 35 other states are joining! Affirmative action efforts requiring institutions of higher learning to employ representative numbers of minority faculty and staff are being resisted with mounting fury and this resistance - spreading like a plague in the middle ages -- is being led by such alleged liberals as Sidney Hook, retired Professor of Philosophy of New York University, and Nathan Glazer of Harvard!

The bottom line of this ominous activity amounts to this: Limit the admission of minority students; allow institutions of higher learning to discriminate as they please and still enjoy federal money; kill efforts to make affirmative action programs work as they have in the business community.

III. Those of us who happen to be members of minority groups have no difficulty, borne of long practice, in composing the litanies that describe our pain. But too often, we fail to suggest remedies. So let me try:

1. Those of us who are committed to the cause of equalizing educational opportunity for the neglected minorities must join hands with the larger educational community in the effort to renew the nation's lagging faith in and commitment to education, for without this, special programs for the neglected minorities, equal to the dimensions of the problem, have a snowball's chance in hell of being sustained.
2. We cannot be effective in our effort to help restore the faith in and commitment to education, unless we are secure in our own. And just in case that you, too, have been seduced by the flood of reactionary anti-education propaganda, let me remind you that education --and especially higher education --is the surest means our society offers for achieving what sociologists call "upward social mobility." Put in simple language, it means that education is the only way that a child born into a functionally illiterate welfare family, or simply a very poor family, can escape the poverty, the squalor, the frustration, the hopelessness, and the dehumanization that characterize his conditions of life. With a college education that leads to some socially useful career, this child cannot only escape but will serve as an emulative example for others, similarly situated. And it goes without saying that his own progeny will begin life as middle class children, destined to carry on like other middle class children.
3. Those of you who actually administer special programs for minorities in higher education can no longer take for granted that these programs have already justified their reason for being. My own guess is that

their justification, like liberty, will require "eternal" vigilance and effort. This means keeping meticulous records, conducting the relevant research that generates hard data. Not only must the data be generated but imaginative ways must be found to give such data wide currency where it counts. Timothy Healy, formerly Vice Chancellor of C.U.N.Y. and now President of Georgetown University, has been an articulate spokesman for open admission, for example. Last March, I heard him speaking before nearly 3,000 educators from all over the nation in a plenary session of the National Conference on Higher Education in Chicago. Toward the end of that moving speech, he said:

> Each year C.U.N.Y. has spent about $30,000,000 on its open admissions students. Over five years that comes to $150,000,000. If this amount pulled 25,000 young citizens out of the poverty cycle, each pull costs $8,000. There are lots of ways to spend $8,000. Two of them leap to mind. Eight thousand dollars is about a year of welfare or six months of prison. Future historians are not going to be hard put to see how inexpensive the city's chief assets, its children, really were.

4. Until such time as we can produce enough alumni from such programs to do it for themselves, we must be their surrogate constituency. Don't laugh! Any one who has read the history of religions or even Eric Hoffer's The True Believer knows what a small band of committed believers can do. As one cynic put it: "It isn't necessary to go whole hog in the effort to fool all of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time, or all of the people all of the time. The first two of these are enough." And this is true about selling the sound idea that will

make the difference in the lives of thousands and thousands of young men and women.

As the surrogate constituency for Equal Opportunity Programs we must:

1. Build the case for the program and keep it valid and current with documented evidence;
2. Use the case to get Equal Opportunity Programs institutionalized where this does not now obtain;
3. Communicate the case to all of the people who need to know -- presidents, deans, governing boards, legislators, newspapers, and other opinion makers in the larger community;
4. Mobilize even the small alumni of those programs that now exist to help espouse the cause when appropriations are being threatened, when questions are being raised.

There is a passage in the Old Testament that sets forth the prescription for what we need to do. It says:

> Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon your hand, that they may be as frontlets between your eyes.
>
> And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way when thou liest down and when thou risest up. And thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thine house and upon thy gates.

IV. We have gathered here to begin a conference that should help us to renew our own faith and commitment in Equal Opportunity Programs, to share our problems and our successes, to drain the speakers and resource people of every useful idea they have, for the bottom line, in another context,

says that you are the surrogate constituency for thousands upon thousands of young men and women who have almost no one else on whom they can really depend.

SOME PRESSING QUESTIONS

T. Edward Hollander
Deputy Commissioner
for Higher and Professional Education
State Education Department

When Commissioner Nyquist sometimes half facetiously refers to this as the The Age of the Querulous, I know what he is talking about. It is a time when most of our long-established institutions are being called into question, by serious people and for serious reasons. Let me try to share with you some of the questions which will directly or indirectly effect most of you; it sure looks like it will affect me.

1. Why is higher education under such attack now?

In more than one way, postsecondary education is caught between the rock and the hard place. While it holds to a vision of increasing access it struggles with the problem of maintaining a reasonable quality. When higher education was in a seller's market, with many more seeking entry than could be accomodated, accountability was, in many cases, quite frankly, almost completely lacking.

Consumerism has come to the college as it has to most facets of American life. A shudder ran through much of the higher education community when a woman in Connecticut recently successfully sued a college for having given her a degree without imparting the skills and the abilities which the degree should have implied. There is schizophrenia in the establishment as we attempt to reconcile larger and larger numbers of entrants with long-held

notions of standards and quality. The same public interest groups which lobby for low or free tuition at the public universities, and lobby to lower barriers for entrance, these are the same groups which deplore in the next breath the poor quality of the education provided by the institution. We are in the middle as we seek to extend access yet we must maintain the real worth of a college degree. Society expects that we shall devise the program to accomplish the difficult and we are expected to do so with inadequate equipment and we shall.

2. Is increased access then still a State commitment?

Reducing barriers to the promotion of equal educational opportunity remains a very high priority in our State. The continuing institutionalization at State levels of the Tuition Assistance Program is the best evidence of this commitment. While the program still has many "bugs" to be worked out, it is noble in its conception: to reduce, as nearly as possible, the economic barriers that limit a potential student's ability to attend the institution of his choice. The next few years will require a special effort from many of us simply to make sure that the original promise and purpose of the TAP program remains undiminished. Public officials are now looking for places where the belt can be tightened even further, and the TAP program, because of its size and budget overruns, has become a ready target.

Some of the recent so-called innovations which, among other things, have the appearance of extending access, are giving access a bad name. When in some areas of the State, entry level college courses are indistinguishable from the subject matter of the high school and even junior high school

curriculum, when high income families emancipate their children for TAP benefits, when the proliferation of extension centers with few controls for quality is so rapid that no one can keep up with it, when so few expectations are placed on students in terms of progress and grades that it is nearly impossible to fail, when some of our colleges--just a few--are using the TAP program to exploit the elderly, for institutional revenue, we must together be concerned that these abuses will deprive persons of resources they genuinely need for higher education.

For the time being, we must recognize too that there are fiscal limits to how far we can extend higher education. TAP is a terribly expensive program to put into place. While the Department and the Regents philosophically support the extension of the Tuition Assistance Program to all students, whether they attend full or part-time, we will have to defer immediate extension of the program to part-time students. Again, City University found that a free tuition policy and open access could not both be maintained; two worthy principles had simply run up against an impossible set of circumstances for the City, the State, and indeed, the country. City University sacrificed free tuition to save open access. Even that fundamental principle is being called into question for fiscal reasons.

There are broader social patterns involved. Nobody knows for sure what a reasonable best college-going rate for high school seniors should be. There is some evidence that we are close to that limit. What <u>will</u> require our best thinking is, in an increasingly credentials-conscious and technocratic society, to devise better postsecondary experiences for young people. We will have to do so when the question is again raised: should every one go to

college? I know what that question means and you had better know it too.

3. Have the racial minorities had their day?

In education, as in other areas, I know that many of us are troubled over what we perceive as a falling away from the emphasis in the 1960's on correcting historic injustices. I think that there are some elements of truth in this perception. But many of the social gains made on behalf of racial minorities in the sixties have become institutionalized. They are almost, but not quite, a permanent part of the fabric of our life: in employment practices, voting rights, and in many other areas, not quite yet in education. The legal and fiscal barriers to higher education which held back so many from entrance into colleges and universities are nearly gone. A great influx of minority college students began to enter our institutions eight or ten years ago, and it has had a permanent impact on those institutions. I refer to areas such as curriculum, where in addition to new major courses of study, we have the broadening of the entire curriculum to reflect more completely the whole American experience; the area of student affairs, with a much richer campus social and cultural life now than we have ever seem before; and more sensitivity in hiring and promotional policies at all the institutions. It is a fact that there are only a handful of minority presidents in New York State colleges and institutions--and none, I might add, at the State University or the independent higher institutions--but there is a whole generation of middle level administrators, part of and well capable of managing the system, who are among the next generation of leadership.

Recently we were able to find out that of full-time entering freshmen in the State, minority groups were running at around 16%--a higher percentage than their representation in the total traditional college level age group. We know of no other place in the country where this kind of progress is evident. I think that even in management and fiscal terms, this increasing percentage bodes well for minority interests. Institutions cannot pass over the fact that significant portions of their enrollment are made up of minority group students; it would be institutional suicide for them to do so.

But there is a danger of resting on laurels not yet fully secure. We are a generation of fickle liberals: blacks, then Puerto Ricans were "in" for a while, it seems, then, especially in certain parts of the country, Native Americans; then adults or working people or union members or the elderly; now women. None of our interests are served, I think, if we vie for the claim as to whose ox was gored the worst, that is, who has suffered the greatest social injustice. What is important to remember is that the access of each group within our society is achieved when opportunity is available to all--and the task is yet unfinished.

I am not sure how equal college access really is if minorities are entering the system in disproportionately large numbers at the two-year level, or found concentrating in certain majors. The final measure of achievement of access, it seems to me, would be a roughly equal distribution across all of higher education for all of our different groups. Further, within the racial minorities there are very large numbers of people to whom

access was denied when they were young. They are still left out, and here we have a long way to go.

We have poor data on minority access to graduate school in this State, but I expect it follows the national pattern: under-representation of minorities in every graduate field--even education, where the vast majority of minority graduate students are concentrated. There is an ongoing debate na ionally as to how to approach this problem. I have just seen, as have many of you, I am sure, that the State of California, which attempted an aggressive affirmative action program for its graduate school system, has found that the courts were not sympathetic to that approach. Here again, we will need new initiatives and good thinking in the days ahead.

4. What is the governance quarrel in this State all about?

To answer this question is to get me going on a lecture on the relationship between politics and education, which I will save for another time. But it is important for you to know some of the ingredients in the boiling pot. First, there is the fact that the Regents function in our State as virtually a fourth and semi-autonomous branch of government. Recent governors from both parties have been uncomfortable with the fact that one State agency had the luxury of being able to determine educational policy, and none of the hardship involved in raising the tax money necessary to pay for the implementation of those policies.

Second, we have been fortunate to have in our last two Education Commissioners courageous men of broad vision who have not sought the easy

road on such tough questions as review of educational quality at all levels of the State, problems in the schools regarding racial integration, and the like. But a bold and courageous stance does not make for popularity.

Third, there is a general dissatisfaction with education in the country, as well as the State, because of skyrocketing costs of local assistance and because of the somewhat distressing results that so many parents see. Rational men will agree that it is simplistic to blame these conditions solely on one State agency when society itself is undergoing a trauma about how it should educate its children and, indeed, what the educated person is. Nevertheless, this, too, is part of the governance issue.

Fourth, as enrollments appear to dwindle in the days ahead or the money dries up, the fragile spirit of good will which for a short time institutions in the public and independent sectors of higher education exhibited, has gone away again. It is a tremendous task to finance and preserve and coordinate a system which involves the first and third largest public universities in the world, and a very rich and variegated independent higher education network. Here, the access, quality, and financing issues all come up. But issues of institutional survival are trivial; there are two more fundamental issues.

5. Is there still a role for the Special Opportunity Programs?

This is not an unreasonable question. We must try to deal with it reasonably. Certainly, personal circumstances aside, there are few of us who would wish a permanent continuation of these special programs. We look forward to a day when they will no longer be necessary.

But that day is not yet.

By the Fall of 1974, the special State programs of opportunity accounted for one out of every three minority students in undergraduate attendance. There is a wide range and extent of the impact. The least is at the two-year institutions in the City of New York, where 19% of the blacks and 24% of the Puerto Ricans in attendance are in College Discovery. But these are also institutions where minorities constitute the greatest number and percentage of "regular" admissions.

The impact is greatest at the State University operated campuses, where 58% of Puerto Ricans and 66% of all blacks on the campuses attend college through the Educational Opportunity Program. Thus it is clear that the programs are a vitally important factor in retaining the gains we have made in access.

For a time at the City University, it looked as though, with Open Admissions, questions might be raised about the role of SEEK at the four-year institutions. The new policies in the process of being established by the Board of Higher Education in the City, however, make it clear to me that SEEK will retain its key position as the best guarantor for the years ahead that blacks and Puerto Ricans will remain a significant part of the makeup of the senior colleges in CUNY.

We are all agreed, I think, that without the pioneering efforts of the opportunity programs in developing the techniques and strategies for serving the academic needs of the disadvantaged, the institutions would now be nearly helpless in the face of declining reading and writing abilities and other cognitive skills on the part of the regular student bodies. I

think the campuses will continue to look for assistance and advice from the special opportunity programs as they develop wider, but similar, services for all of their students. In many, many cases, the opportunity program staff and structure are the basis upon which these strategies and arrangements are built.

There will be, as I think many realize, a necessary shift in emphasis in these programs. At the time they were begun, very little financial aid outside of the old Federal EOG (now SEOG) and related programs was available for the truly poor college student. With both BEOG and TAP now at levels no one envisioned not long ago, I think we can anticipate more and more emphasis on an entitlement approach to financial aid. But the strength of these opportunity programs is in their supportive services, in their admissions policies, and in the results they achieve with students who were supposed to fail. This is where their future leads. Yet, until TAP and BEOG catch up with real costs to the poor for higher education, the extra State subsidy, I think, will be available and justified for the doubly disadvantaged persons the programs serve.

In any case, we need to break away from the stipend mentality which even some students in the program have. Most students in most of the programs finance significant parts of their own education. Where they do not, we will work toward some reasonable self-help expectation. In all cases, we must work toward changing the harmful public image, which so often dogs our heels, of a program which gives away money and very little else. It just ain't so.

The question of instituionalization has come up at this conference and will be with us as long as the programs are in existence. I personally look forward to the day when the services now provided under these special arrangements have become totally institutionalized. This will not happen tomorrow, however, for the following reasons.

First, there is value in the concentration of resources in a discrete area at the institution, and for a discrete population. When monies for a good purpose are rapidly spent over a broad area, they lose their impact.

Second, I recognize the emotional needs of the disadvantaged at campuses which they still perceive, and with some reason, as hostile at worst and indifferent at best. The program is a home base at the campus, where students can be comfortable knowing that there are persons around whose sole function is to eliminate the institutional barriers to their success. Here we have important role models, cultural activities, and other necessary ingredients to program effectiveness for now.

It is hard to talk about details, but one thing is sure: we will have to do better than before, using resources we now have. We will not grow as we did. Higher education has undergone its big expansion. In the view of many we have more than enough to do the job.

Some things we can be pretty confident about. There is a certainty that we will have a decreasing population of college age. From 1975 to 1985, the number of persons in the fifteen-to--nineteen-year-old age group will decline by 14.9% and by 1995, by 22.8%. Last year, higher education enrollment declined for the first time in recent history.

The amount of State resources devoted to education for the last few years has been shrinking as a percentage of the total State budget. At the same time, the increase in the tax base has slowed down. One slight ray of hope is that because enrollments at the elementary and secondary levels will decrease more rapidly than those in postsecondary education, post-secondary education may end up with a slightly larger proportion of the total State education dollar than it currently has. But I wouldn't hang my hat on this.

The twenty to thirty-nine age group will increase 13.1% within the next five years alone. There will be empty classrooms if the colleges continue to serve only their current age group population. We can expect some increases in services to older adults by the postsecondary community. All the colleges and universities know these trends and are trying to plan for them, but it would be well not to count on the older potential college student as the only salvation.

There will probably be some stricter standards imposed on what higher education does through the various accreditation procedures. The resolution of the now pending SUNY case against the State Education Department and the Regents in regard to the review of quality doctoral programs--which, of course, I expect to be in the Department's favor--along with other trends, shows that the proliferations of duplicative courses and services will slow down. We have to take care that the State controls quality, but does not abridge academic freedom. We have to consider that we are not yet really very sophisticated in predicting manpower needs, although with the State supporting

all of higher education so heavily, I do anticipate more and more pressure to control somewhat the flow of trained manpower toward some directions and away from others coming out of higher education. We will resist that pressure.

Lastly, I expect that we will not lose the commitment to variety and to educational options and to freedom of choice and educational success for higher education in this State. The State University can only build on what is now a very strong base. The City University, uniquely adapted to the needs of our country's greatest metropolitan sector, will continue to play an important role; it is essential that it remain an independent entity.

I can think of no times which have been more difficult than those of the last few years for higher education and for me...except for the period we are about to enter. We will need our best brains and talent and vision and hope to cope with the problems we now have and those which we have not even anticipated. But it will be a great challenge, and I look forward to working with all of you toward the solutions I know we will find.

THE EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Edgar D. Draper
President
Borough of Manhattan Community College

For too long, American higher education has been developed in elitist institutions with academic requirements and tuition that precluded many under-achieving disadvantaged high school graduates with potential from entering the American mainstream. Whether or not we consciously planned the process, the fact is that the American college has become the great dividing line between the "successful" and the "not so successful." The college graduate has gravitated to the top in American instituional life in both the public and the private sectors. A college education, therefore, has been the primary qualifying criterion for high level appointments and upward mobility.

It took a social revolution in the sixties to shake up the higher education establishment and to make us realize that the "gown" and the "town" would have to relate to each other. Not just by making profound studies of social dislocations, but also by giving the people in the "town" an opportunity to be actual participants in the educational process.

Special programs were developed in states and urban centers throughout America to conceptualize and manage the expanding opportunities. Admission

requirements were altered, new sources for financial aid were developed, remediation was emphasized to correct deficiencies, minority enrollments were increased and special recruitment programs were initiated for minority faculty and staff. The American college campus began to take its proper place toward the realization of the American Dream.

Yet, the gains of the sixties are today under threat, not by aggressive revolutionary forces, but by regressive economic forces.

The student disruptions of the sixties were severe and distasteful, but the basic elements for institutional survival were not destroyed.

The economic recession of the 1970's strikes harshly at the advances which helped high school graduates and adults who came to higher education by way of equal opportunity programs.

Consequently, we are in a period of caution, retrenchment and survival with limited possibilities for launching new, innovative and expanding opportunities for the disadvantaged.

Educational opportunity has been fundamental to our way of life and the basis for much of our progress as a nation. It has not, however, been extended equally to all members of our society.

A recent analysis by the Insitute for the Study of Educational Policy, based at Howard University, indicates major gains in the last 20 years by blacks in higher education, although they have been irregular and inadequate.

Most black students in the 1973-74 academic year were likely to be

enrolled in public two-year colleges and predominantly black four-year colleges. In 1973, 40% of the blacks were in two-year instituions, but only 24% of the whites were in two-year institutions.

While gains were made in numbers, blacks have been concentrated in lower-cost, less selective institutions.

In the Fall of 1974, 814,000 black men and women, or 8% of the 16 to 34-year-old population, were attending some form of postsecondary education. This is in contrast to 7.8 million, or 14% for whites in the same age range.

Land-grant colleges, for example, which had their origin in the Morrill Act of 1862, were initially established for whites only.

Beginning in 1890, 28 years later, land-grant colleges were established for blacks. Since 1890, 16 states have maintained a dual system of land-grant colleges.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture continues to provide only meager appropriations to black land-grant educational institutions. The white colleges received from federal, state and local funds, $268 million for the 1972 fiscal year, while the black colleges were allocated a total of $17 million.

In New York State, we have made significant progress in extending higher education opportunity during the past decade.

The story of that progress is quite familiar to this audience. But allow me to make a few comments.

We have in New York State the "big six" urban areas with large concentrations of educationally and economically disadvantaged blacks and Spanish-speaking persons. About 37% of these persons had not obtained or sought postsecondary education--thousands of them were dropouts and pushouts. The State University has increased its minority enrollment, however, from 5,852 or 3.7% in 1969, to 15,134 or 7.1% in 1974. Over 6,000 Educational Opportunity Program students are enrolled in two and four-year colleges.

There are two higher education opportunity programs operated by the City University of New York that preceded Open Admissions and provided valuable background experience. One is College Discovery, which began in 1964, and the other is SEEK which began in 1966. College Discovery has grown from 231 students at two community colleges in 1964, to 4,100 students today, with comprehensive programs at seven community colleges. Approximately 3,000 students have earned their Associate Degrees and most continue their education at four-year colleges. The SEEK Program has grown from 450 students in 1966 at three senior colleges, to 10,600 students in nine senior colleges. Approximately 2,800 SEEK students have graduated.

College Discovery and SEEK have not only made it possible for large numbers of disadvantaged students to receive adequate funds for defraying their college expenses, but also, these programs have provided counseling and guidance activities that were critical for student success.

The City University of New York is perhaps the best example in the

nation for expanding higher education opportunity with the introduction of Open Admissions in 1970. I suppose one might say it was the fulfillment of the dream of Townsend Harris, Chairman of the New York Board of Education, who said on the occasion of the founding of the Free Academy in 1847:

> Open the doors to all. Let the children of the rich and the poor take their seats together and know of no distinction save that of industry, good conduct and intellect.

One hundred and twenty-three years later, with the help of black and Puerto Rican students on the South Campus of City College, the dream began to become a reality.

During the first two years of Open Admissions, the enrollment of blacks increased 21%, Puerto Ricans 9%, and disadvantaged whites, 70%. Most of the Open Admission students were from families with incomes less than $9,000 per year.

Open Admissions, despite dire warnings, criticism and opposition, was not an impractical dream, but was rather a dramatic, realistic opportunity for expanding higher education to all high school graduates.

It has been documented, in subsequent research and study, that large numbers of persons with a high school education, who would not have been admitted prior to Open Admissions, had the capacity to pursue and benefit from college level studies.

There were those, of course, who voiced disagreement with the viability and purpose of open admissions programs. But we know now, after six years

of development, that Open Admissions works and that its recipients have had a comparatively high rate of academic success.

There are many persons who have concluded that the severe budget crisis in New York City has brought an end to open admissions. I do not believe that is so. I have confidence that open admissions will not die. We have, of course, seen alterations in the policies under which we admit students to the City University of New York.

It is regrettable that as the pressures subside, the rules begin to change, enrollments decrease, tuition is increased, retention standards go up, and many of the new minority faculty members have been retrenched. It is ironic, in a country with such vast wealth, that the gradual loss of our gains during the past decade will be attributed to a recession and the lack of adequate resources.

Let me, using the Borough of Manhattan Community College, review some of the impact of Open Admissions on one institution. We started in 1964 with some 20% of our student body black and Puerto Rican, but the minority enrollment due to Open Admissions increased by 1975 to 70%.

Most of our students, including full-time and part-time enrollees, come from Harlem, East Harlem and the Lower East Side of Manhattan. While the concentration is from these neighborhoods, our student body has representation from all the boroughs in New York City. They are mostly from the lower levels of high school achievement and from families with incomes less than $8,000 per year. More than 41% are from households in which

English is not the primary language. Our students are older than the national average--62.4% are over twenty-three years old.

We conducted a survey to determine what had happened to graduates of the College in the Class of 1973. It is important to understand that among these alumni were some of the first Open Admissions students of the College. We found that 87% of the graduates had continued their education at four-year institutions, and 73% were employed. A large number, therefore, were continuing their studies while working. 88% of those who continued their studies enrolled at units of the City University of New York.

A number of those who were not at the time enrolled in senior institutions indicated that they planned to continue formal higher education as soon as possible. Virtually all of the graduates, therefore, who could reasonably be expected to do so, continued their formal higher education.

Another interesting fact is that 50% of the alumni who had pursued career programs, continued their studies in institutions of higher education. Eighty-three and a half percent of the respondents indicated that they had received Bachelor's Degrees, or were enrolled in such programs at the time they returned their questionnaires.

A total of 15.3% of the graduates were already in graduate programs and nearly half of the others indicated that they would undertake graduate work later.

Of the full-time employed graduates, nearly all, 94.2%, were working

in positions classfied as professional, paraprofessional, managerial, clerical and skilled labor with a mean annual salary of $11,047.

In another study conducted by the Office of Program and Policy Research of the City University of New York, it was revealed that, among CUNY Community Colleges, our College had the highest retention rate for the seven semesters after Open Admissions was inaugurated.

Although free tuition, as we have known it at the City University for 128 years, has been abolished, the decrease in our student body is almost negligible. In fact, the enrollment for the Fall exceeded the advance projections and we found ourselves at registration needing more classes and more teachers than we expected. We enrolled 9,639 students--only 560 less than for the Fall, 1975.

It is also important to note in this regard that, although free tuition was eliminated, the tuition assistance program--TAP--and other financial aid programs are filling the gap for many economically disadvantaged students.

We have some marginal freshman students with less than 70% high school average in a trasitional program, and a large number of students in remedial programs who meet the new standards but who are without adequate skills to pursue college-level courses. It is ironic that, after charging tuition, we are without adequate funds for remediation.

There are some persons who feel, and with reason, that the recent fiscal crisis was a blessing in disguise, for it dramatized the signigicant question that harbors in the minds of all of us who are concerned about higher educa-

tion opportunity. That question is: Does higher education receive sufficient priority among agencies and institutions competing for the available resources?

My answer is a resounding, NO!

It is inconceivable and tragic that a nation with such massive resources makes available such a small percentage of its gross national product for education.

There is little question but that our national survival depends primarily on the quality of life for all our citizens. That quality is in no small measure a function of our ability to provide higher education to an ever-increasing proportion of the poor and disadvantaged.

Educational opportunity is not exclusively a minority group matter. It is a basic goal for a democratic society. It is simply a matter of whether there is adequate access to the broad spectrum of knowledge, vocational skills, and socializing experiences for all the youth of our nation without regard to race or individual economic circumstances.

We are challenged with the responsibility of correcting wrongs that still persist in our society and on our campuses. We must be concerned about those who are left out of the plans for higher education and who are potential contributors to our society.

We must reach out through expanded, and creative new programs to help those individuals to become benefactors rather than dependents on society's resources. We should want as many as possible to be full participants in our economic, social and cultural life.

We must keep the faith so that the progress which was made in the sixties will continue. Most of us were caught up in the agonizing turbulence of that period. We worked for change, and sometimes reluctantly accommodated to change under unrelenting pressures. We fought for educational opportunities in our cities, our neighborhoods and communities where thousands of young people were being tragically bypassed for reasons over which they had little or no control. Our ultimate goal, however, is providing higher educational opportunity for all our young people who have the desire and the ability, for those older persons who come back into formal education after periods of absence, and for senior citizens imbued with the thirst for education. They seek better job opportunities, new skills, cultural enrichment, and a chance to contribute to the social and economic development of the society. They are individuals with potential, although varied in degree of motivation and capacity, who respond to educational programs that meet their needs.

Dr. Clark Kerr, in one of his Carnegie Commission Reports, "A Degree and What Else," said, "Going to College--any College--does give to the individual a chance for a more satisfying life, and to the society the likelihood of a more selective community. Individuals who go to college tend to be:

1. more 'liberal' and tolerant in their attitudes toward and in their relations with other individuals and groups in the society;

2. more satisfied with their jobs;
3. more highly paid and less subject to unemployment;
4. more thoughtful and deliberate in their consumer expenditures;
5. more likely to vote and to participate generally in community activities; and
6. more informed about community, national and world affairs."

It would seem that any institution in society that achieves such results is worthy of the highest priority for the investment of our local, state and national resources.

In spite of our institutional achievements, members of state legislatures and city councils are questioning our value, demanding more precise justification for each dollar, limiting our programs, reducing our resources, and seeking alternate routes to achieving educational goals.

Never before in the history of American higher education have we faced such severe demands for justifying our existence and the importance of our contribution to American life and progress.

As educators, we can serve our nation best by maintaining the momentum for educational opportunity that developed during the past decade.

This organization, and all others committed to higher education, must be united with a singleness of purpose to bring about the strongest possible pressures to insure that the necessary funds will be provided to not only maintain higher educational opportunity, but also to expand the educational

horizons for all.

I have the faith that together we can make a significant contribution toward our mutual goal.

HEOP AND HOPE

Ewald B. Nyquist
President, State University of New York
and Commissioner of Education

If there are miracles in higher education, surely one of them is the establishment of Malcolm-King College by Mattie Cook and her gifted associates. Creating new learning opportunities for adults in central Harlem as a cooperative venture, staffed by top-notch faculty from some of New York's best colleges and universities, is an achievement that merits the highest commendation. I am delighted that the State Education Department is able to be of assistance through the Higher Education Opportunity Program.

In my speech tonight, I have elected to emphasize ways in which all of us can improve the effectiveness of opportunity programs and bring more students into them by working together in skilled and elegant harmony--or concinnity.

First, however, let me comment just briefly about changing conditions that could make our task even harder in the years ahead.

A long, slow and often painful process of achieving equality of opportunity for all reached what might have been its high point between the 1950's and early 1970's, beginning with the historic United States Supreme Court decision

in Brown v. Board of Education declaring that school segregation is morally wrong, educationally unsound, and constitutionally impermissible. This court ruling was followed by some of the most enlightened legislation ever adopted by the Congress, including the creation in 1972 of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants. I remind you that appropriations for BEOG's went from zero dollars four years ago to $1.5 billion in the current academic year. Important laws were also enacted in the different states which signaled a real determination to open higher education to people who had been discriminated against far too long because of their race, national origin, religion, and, yes, too, their sex. New York was unquestionably a national leader in righting the wrongs of the past. Our political authorities were second to none in supporting educational programs at all levels that were aimed at giving an extra measure of help to those who were most in need. One could hardly tell the difference between Republicans and Democrats when it came to appropriating the funds that made possible a wider and wider range of learning opportunities through programs like HEOP, EOP, SEEK, and College Discovery.

Indeed, the last decade or so was an expansionist, psychedelic period of butter-tub affluence, of seemingly unending growth in quality and equality of opportunity, a period of ferment, innovation, reform and experimentalism, a time in which we all bathed in a tidal wave of euphoria and had good reasons to believe that no one would ever again be denied access to our postsecondary system if only that person had the desire and the intellectual ability to attend a college or university in this State.

Today, by contrast, neither education generally nor opportunity programs specifically seem to rank high on the ladder of public priorities or the hierachy of values associated with the good life. Much of the rhetoric in the recent election campaigns, especially when Ronald Reagan was in the running for the presidency, showed how much educators have now become whipping boys for political office-holders and office-seekers alike. I am somehow reminded of the candidate some years ago who got elected by going around telling the voters his opponent was a philanthropist whose wife had once been a thespian. In the present case, members of both political parties are making political hay by denigrating education, rather than defending it, saying it costs too much, that the schools are failing, that there are too many frills, that too many students are going on to college when there aren't enough jobs to go around (as if vocationalism is the only purpose of education), and that schools and colleges ought to be run more efficiently, like business corporations. I keep asking which corporations: Penn Central, Lockheed, W.T.Grant, Chase Manhattan Bank, Abercrombie and Fitch in New York? And I won't go into the issue of comparative integrity. One need only mention the many cases of political corruption and the corruptive corporate business practices, including bribery and illegal political contributions.

This is why I have been saying in recent months that it is quite possible that education is in the first stage of a long twilight, an evening twilight, not a morning twilight, which, together with the familiar doubts about whether educators have promised too much and delivered too little, and the

substantial loss of public confidence in our educational institutions and those who work in and run them, will consist of markedly reduced financial support, fewer students, lessened quality, and curtailed educational opportunity. So there is a clear and present danger that unless all of us in education work hard for our mutual cause, unless we interpret in many wise ways to the public and political authorities what it is we are doing and why it deserves a high priority, unless we plan ahead and help others to do so, unless we make the most efficient and economical use of the resources we have, unless we lead instead of simply following out front, we are in for a long period of gradual decline.

To cite just one example of particular concern to this audience, State funding of opportunity programs has leveled off and there has been no growth in the number of students in such programs for two years. Thousands of qualified persons are being turned away.

It is true, of course, that the Tuition Assistance Program adopted by the Legislature a couple of years ago benefits students in the lowest economic groups considerably. However, as significant as TAP is, disadvantaged students also need special services like tutoring, counseling, and remedial work which opportunity programs provide, if these students are to succeed in reaching their educational objective. This is why the Regents have recommended expanding the opportunity programs by 1,000 students a year through 1980. In other words, we cannot afford to stand still. We have to get across the message that even with TAP and BEOG's, the neediest people

are not going to get into college and complete their studies unless additional State resources are forthcoming. Colleges cannot be asked to pick up more and more of the cost burden when their budgets are as tight as they are. So the Legislature and the Governor must get opportunity programs growing again.

In this regard, I hope the 1977 Legislature will reconsider, in particular, the funding of programs at the State University and City University community colleges. No accountability is now required for the enriched Full Opportunity Program support these colleges receive, and opportunity program students often are provided with only the bare minimum of vitally needed academic assistance.

There is no question whatever in my mind that dollars spent on opportunity programs are dollars well spent. Anyone who thinks otherwise (and there are critics who think too many students are going to college and minority groups are getting too much of a break) ought to read the results of a study conducted over a seven-year period by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. The study is, in effect, a profile of the poor in America. A summary was carried just last week in U.S. News and World Report. According to the magazine account, the Michigan researchers concluded that education is the most important single factor in determining whether a family winds up being "persistently poor," which is defined as being below the poverty threshold for more than a year at a time. The study shows that

that having six years of schooling reduces a person's chances of being persistently poor from approximately 40 percent to 20 percent and that additional education beyond the sixth grade further insures escaping poverty, although to a lesser degree. But the point in the study that I want to stress is this: while six grades of schooling cuts a white family's chance of being persistently poor to about one in five, it takes at least some college training to do the same for blacks.

Therefore, since New York's opportunity programs serve large numbers of students from minority groups, it becomes increasingly evident that these programs are upward sloping ramps out of poverty.

The latest figures reveal that roughly one-third of all minority group members who are full-time undergraduates were admitted through a State-supported opportunity program. In fact, two of every three blacks attending the State University are EOP students. This is the highest proportion. It drops to fewer than 20 percent in College Discovery at City University community colleges.

Incidentally, just to round out the picture, 16 percent of the total number of entering freshmen are now from the various minority groups. This is higher than the percentage of minority persons in the traditional college-age population. No other state can match this record of accomplishment. So we have a lot to be proud of. And yet, as the old American adage reminds us, if we had not already done so much, we would not still have so much to do. There are always miles to go and promises to keep, as the lovely line

from Robert Frost points out.

For one thing, we must distinguish between access and success.

Access to our postsecondary system has been made far easier in recent years, largely because of the growth of the community college network from one end of the State to the other. But many students who enroll at the community colleges simply cannot get the structured academic support they need to overcome learning deficiencies because there is no clear source of funding. The result is that attrition rates reach 60 percent and more. This is hardly what I call success.

Along the same vein, I am not happy either with the high dropout rate among minorities in New York's big city school systems. As a case in point, only 41 percent of the kids from Spanish-surnamed families who enter the ninth grade in New York City go on to the twelfth grade. The proportion is 53 percent for blacks. The State must no longer allow such a waste of human resources. Nor should it tolerate such inequity.

At any rate, I am hopeful that more youngsters will complete high school in the years ahead and that high school graduates will be better prepared for college-level study. I say this for two reasons. One is that the quality of instruction ought to improve as a result of the emphasis the Department and I are giving to competency-based teacher certification. In addition, as you know, all students will be required to demonstrate adult-level competency in reading and arithmetic in order to obtain a high

school diploma, beginning in 1979.

Another concern I have relates to the pressing need that exists today to expand educational opportunities for adults in the inner cities, in particular, who did not obtain an adequate level of education earlier in their lives for whatever reason and now want to study in programs that take into account the fact that they have family obligations and cannot attend college full-time. As I said at the start of my remarks, Malcolm-King College is one kind of learning option that serves this need and does it well.

Let me turn now to some other concerns that are worth mentioning on this occasion.

Many disadvantaged students do not fit neatly into the existing catagories for Federal and State financial aid entitlement programs. In this connection, the new State regulations related to emancipation adversely affect many minority group members by failing to recognize special situations, such as cases in which it is extremely difficult for adult students to comply with the "parental petition" section of the Financial Independence Supplement to the Student Payment Application. For example, I have been told about a 27-year-old man who has been married for six years and has two children, who was outraged that he had to ask his parents to attest to his financial independence. Similarly, a 30-year-old black woman found it almost impossible to have the form completed properly because her parents are illiterate and live in South Carolina miles from a notary public, whose functions they do

not comprehend anyway.

This is not the time or the place for me to make specific recommendations for remedying this situation. But I hope some progress will come out of this Conference since representatives of the Higher Education Services Corporation are here.

Our cause was not helped either by the recent audit report of the Higher Opportunity Program containing an estimate--and it was just an estimate--that $2.8 million may have been spent from 1969 through 1975 on students who were ineligible for assistance. I want to emphasize that the Department of Audit and Control reviewed eligibility documentation for only 1,093 students at five colleges. The percentage of ineligible students at the five colleges ranged from 2.3 percent to 17.2 percent. Not so parenthetically, about half the cases involved very small amounts of money. That is, the students may have been within $40 or so of being eligible. Moreover, 70 percent of the students surveyed were part-time students, and there are very few part-time students in HEOP. Most of the part-time students were in a couple of those five colleges and one cannot generalize, as the auditors did, for the whole higher education community. The auditors projected their finding that 115 students were ineligible at the time of their admission, to the total of 15,000 students in the program, by assuming the ineligibility rate would be 10.5 percent of the total. That is where the $2.8 million estimate came from.

Well, my purpose here tonight was not to depress your spirits nor to elevate your sensitivites. So let me conclude by saying that I believe our opportunity programs are making a real difference in the lives of people who would otherwise remain locked into poverty and hopelessness. The students you serve do start out underprepared. But they go on to make real progress, as shown by the fact that their grades and credit accumulations do not differ in the long run from those of regularly admitted students. This is a remarkable tribute to their motivation and to your dedication.

Many people deserve the credit for the real gains that have been made. Among them I would like to mention the members of my State Advisory Committee on Educational Opportunity, which is one of the most productive and hard-working groups in all of education in this State. The Committee was especially helpful to me and the Regents during the formulation of the 1976 Statewide Plan. And I want to thank Harold Delaney in particular for consenting to remain as Chairman even after assuming his duties as head of the Educational Equity Group of the National Institute of Education.

This next legislative session is going to be a tough one. As Mattie Cook said earlier, you're going to have to become more tenacious; that means guts and thunder.

It is, indeed, heartening to be with all of you who serve the disadvantaged in higher education in your respective capacities as college presidents, deans, affirmative action officers, teachers, tutors, counselors, and officials of State and Federal agencies. You constitute a powerful and

humanizing force that is not only making education better, but also making society better. As John Hope Franklin, the distinguished black historian, said in a fine address last spring dealing with American education and America's Bicentennial observance:

> This is no time to shout from the housetops about how great we are or to assume the boastful stance of being the most powerful nation in the world . . . A sober look at ourselves at this time should result in a blending of pride with humility, joy with compassion, and our sense of power with a sense of justice. What we as a nation need at this time in our history is to commit ourselves to the principles of democracy and equality and to develop creative programs for their realization. Only when every man, woman, and child in this country has the security that equal rights and equal opportunity can provide will we be justified in calling ourselves a truly great people and a truly great nation.

I know that all of you are led by high aspiration and compelling inspiration to make equality of opportunity the most insistent and pervasive concern of education in this State. May it be said of you, as it was said of the climbers of Mount Everest who, eventually in their arduous ascent, disappeared into the clouds: "When last seen, they were still climbing."

I am proud to be associated with you.